

COMMITTEE EVALUATION  
AND  
REVIEW BOARD  
2002 – 2004

Review and Evaluation of  
Montgomery County, Maryland's  
Boards, Committees and Commissions

FINAL REPORT

July 2004  
Office of the County Executive  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

**COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

July 21, 2004

Honorable Douglas M. Duncan  
County Executive  
101 Monroe Street  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Honorable Steven A. Silverman  
President, Montgomery County Council  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Dear Messrs. Duncan and Silverman:

The Committee Evaluation and Review Board has completed its review of Montgomery County's Boards, Committees and Commissions and presents its final report to you pursuant to Section 2-146(b) of the Montgomery County Code.

We look forward to future discussions regarding the recommendations contained herein.

Sincerely,

/s/

Michael Garr, Co-Chair

/s/

Betsy W. Jett, Co-Chair

Anita Brady  
Adrian Cargill  
Susan A. Cheney  
Howard R. Philips  
Richard Stoll

# COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD FINAL REPORT

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is the Final Report of the 2002-2004 Committee Evaluation and Review Board (hereinafter referred to as “CERB”). The CERB was constituted pursuant to Montgomery County Code Section 2-146(b). The County Executive solicited applications for the nine positions; applicants were interviewed, appointed by the County Executive, and confirmed by the County Council. During the two years of its term, there were five resignations and three new appointments, and the CERB completed its work with only seven active members:

Anita Brady of Olney  
Adrian Cargill of Gaithersburg  
Susan A. Cheney of Bethesda  
Michael J. Garr of Bethesda, Co-Chair  
Betsy W. Jett of Gaithersburg, Co-Chair  
Howard R. Philips of Bethesda  
Richard Stoll of Kensington

The CERB sent an Interim Report to the County Executive and County Council in June 2003 to apprise them of the CERB’s methodology and progress and to present its interim recommendations.

The CERB’s efforts are the first comprehensive evaluation of Montgomery County’s Boards, Committees and Commissions (**referred to individually and collectively as “B/C/C” or as “committee”**) system as a whole since December 1992, when 61 B/C/C were reviewed by the Committee on Committees (“CoC”). In the following years, additional B/C/C were created, bringing to 83 the number of B/C/C for potential CERB review. Certain ad hoc committees, state established committees, and newly-formed B/C/C were excluded from the CERB study. The CERB charge was to:

1. Review individual B/C/C with regard to their mission, membership, number and structure, orientation of new members and effectiveness.
2. Review the B/C/C system as a whole and provide feedback and recommendations to the County Executive and County Council in the following areas:
  - Number of B/C/C
  - Recruitment
  - Compensation
  - Attendance Policy
  - Training
  - Staffing
  - Cost/Benefits
  - Removal of Members

The CERB developed a comprehensive methodology to collect and analyze data, including surveys and questionnaires with chairs, vice chairs, past and present members of B/C/C, department heads, staff liaisons, and others. The CERB attended meetings with every one of the 68 B/C/C in its charge and conducted a survey of seven nearby jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia to compare Montgomery County's committee system with the systems of other jurisdictions.

The CERB's overall conclusion is that the B/C/C system is a large, well-run system that provides significant benefits to the County as a whole. It is supported by over 1,200 County residents who volunteer to serve and, in many instances, provide the equivalent of services performed by paid staff in other jurisdictions. The B/C/C system is viewed positively by the County Government's staff at all levels, by the County Council, and by the County Executive. The B/C/C system provides an important avenue for public participation in County Government and allows the County to benefit from the knowledge and experience of the County's residents in many areas of government concern.

As with any large institution, the B/C/C system must change over time to remain effective and to continue to serve the County's needs. The CERB's two-year study has identified the following key issues that affect the overall B/C/C structure. These issues deserve the full attention and action of the County Executive and the County Council:

1. ***Number of B/C/C*** – Montgomery County has considerably more B/C/C than its neighboring jurisdictions (Prince George's - 51), (Howard - 34) (Anne Arundel - 44). The CERB found that, in many instances, County B/C/C were providing the equivalent of paid staff services in these other jurisdictions. The CERB is recommending little to no change for a majority of the B/C/C, significant changes for some, the elimination of 7 B/C/C, and the consolidation/merger of another 8 B/C/C. If approved in its entirety, this restructuring would bring the B/C/C total to 70 or 71. Specific recommendations are listed by B/C/C.
2. ***Recruitment and Diversity*** – Many B/C/C with specific membership categories frequently have difficulty filling vacancies. The CERB recommends that specific membership categories be used as guidelines for recruitment and not as rigid requirements. In 1992, the CoC found that difficulties exist in recruiting ethnic and low income residents for B/C/C. Ten years later, difficulty in recruiting still exists. Additional outreach efforts are needed, including the use of e-mail and simple online applications. Staff liaisons should take a more active role in recruiting members for their B/C/C. Increasing the travel and dependent care reimbursements should reduce barriers to B/C/C participation.
3. ***Compensation and Reimbursement*** – The County Code provides, among other things, that if a committee member is not compensated for serving on the committee, the member may request reimbursement for travel and dependent care. Currently, the reimbursement is \$5 per meeting for travel and \$12 per meeting for dependent care. These reimbursements have not been changed in many years and do not reflect

current real costs. The CERB recommends increasing reimbursement for travel and dependent care to the following amounts to reflect real costs and to help recruit minorities and low income residents to serve on B/C/C :

\$10 per meeting for reimbursement of travel  
\$30 per meeting for reimbursement of dependent care

The CERB examined the differences between the five (5) paid and ten (10) unpaid Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C, and found a huge variation in pay, but a negligible difference with respect to the following key factors:

- annual work load of the members;
- professional/technical skills required of the members;
- complexity of issues handled by the B/C/C;
- nature of responsibilities (i.e., mission and function) of the B/C/C; and
- whether the B/C/C has historically had difficulties in recruiting members.

The County is currently spending \$241,000 (FY 04 figures) to compensate 5 of these 15 B/C/C. In order to create an equitable, criteria-based compensation program, the CERB is recommending that all 15 Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C be compensated in an equal manner at:

- \$60 per meeting (up to four hours) for B/C/C members
- \$80 per meeting (up to four hours) for B/C/C Chairs
- Plus Dependent Care Reimbursement if eligible

The basis for this recommendation is equal pay for equal value. It will not affect the pay of current B/C/C members and Chairs during their current terms, and over time, it will reduce the total cost to the County of paid compensation to B/C/C.

4. ***Attendance and Length of Service*** – The CERB is recommending that a consistent attendance policy and length of service policy be adopted for all B/C/C. Absences allowed are based on the number of formal meetings held by the B/C/C.

Number of Meetings held in One Year	Allowed Absences
1 – 4	1
5 – 8	2
9 – 12	3
13 – 16	4
17+	5

Additionally, any member who misses three consecutive meetings at any time during the year is in violation of the attendance policy and may be removed. County policy has generally dictated a two-term limit for members of B/C/C. The CERB recommends no change be made to this two term limit. The CERB further recommends adding, at the end of the second term, a three (3) year waiting period to

reapply to the same B/C/C, to encourage wider participation and diversity on each B/C/C.

5. ***Training*** – The CoC, and now the CERB ten years later, found a need for better training for staff, chairs and B/C/C members on a variety of issues from ethics to best practices to running effective meetings. The County has recently implemented a formalized training program for B/C/C chairs, members and staff liaisons. The CERB applauds these efforts and recommends the program have permanent funding and that program attendance be required to continue to serve on a B/C/C.
6. ***Staffing*** – The level and type of support provided by Staff Liaisons varies widely among B/C/C. Quality staffing is a consistent factor among effective Boards. The CERB recommends that the County consolidate B/C/C staffing at the Department level, where possible. This should facilitate communication between B/C/C and lead to other efficiencies.
7. ***Budgeting*** – There is no consistent policy within the County departments and agencies for budgeting the true cost of staff support. A 2002 study found that B/C/C averaged 77+ hours of staff time per month using the equivalent of 37 full-time staff positions. The County is spending almost \$2.1 million on supporting the B/C/C structure. Although the CERB feels this money is well spent, the costs should not be hidden within Departmental budgets. The CERB recommends that each County department and agency include a separate line item in their annual Operating Budget for B/C/C support. This open disclosure of the actual costs of B/C/C support should lead departments to consolidate staff support and provide the County Executive and County Council with the true cost when new B/C/C are considered.
8. ***Removal*** - The CERB recommended in June 2003 that the Montgomery County Code be changed to accommodate a uniform removal policy for all B/C/C. The new policy would authorize the removal of members by the appointing authority for certain specific circumstances and would establish a process for removal of a member at the request of a majority of a committee's members. An appeals process was also recommended.
9. ***Effectiveness*** – Overall, the CERB found that most B/C/C are very effective in meeting their defined missions. Effectiveness results from the combination of general issues affecting all B/C/C and very specific issues for each committee. The CERB is making general recommendations for all B/C/C and specific recommendations for each committee to improve each committee's effectiveness.
10. ***Communications*** – The CERB found a wide discrepancy among the B/C/C with regard to communicating with the public, the media, elected officials, other B/C/C, and each B/C/C's own members. Most B/C/C and County staff are not taking advantage of new technologies and sharing information and best practices. The CERB is recommending that the Department of Technology Services create a B/C/C

Master Plan to utilize new technologies, including an electronic Annual Report template for all B/C/C.

11. **Sunset Provision** - The County does not have an effective means to assess periodically the purpose and mission of B/C/C. The CERB convenes every 10 years and can only view a snapshot of a B/C/C. There is no automatic mechanism to prevent a B/C/C from continuing with a mission that is no longer relevant. As new issues emerge, new B/C/C are created and the B/C/C system could eventually expand beyond the County's ability to support it. The CERB recommends establishing sunset provisions for those B/C/C that are not mandated by State or Federal government. The CERB is also recommending specific criteria to evaluate the renewal of a B/C/C and/or the establishment of a new B/C/C.

In addition to the above-described findings regarding the entire B/C/C system, the CERB's two-year study found numerous issues affecting individual B/C/C performance. The CERB is making the following specific recommendations for the full attention and action of the County Executive and the County Council:

- **Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board** - Needs to shift advisory focus and reporting lines to the Department of Liquor Control.
- **Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council** - Merge with Mental Health Advisory Committee into Behavioral Health Committee to align with the Department of Health and Human Services' current organizational structure.
- **Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs** - Discontinue as formal B/C/C; volunteers will continue to support Division mission.
- **Area Recreation Boards** - All 5 area Boards should be dissolved and area recreation issues handled by the existing County-wide Recreation Board and by the Regional Service Centers' Citizens Advisory Boards.
- **Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board** - Merging all Agricultural Boards into one will provide a stronger voice and better coordination on Agricultural issues.
- **Rustic Roads Advisory Committee** - Can serve as a sub-committee of the merged Agricultural Boards.
- **Agricultural Advisory Board** - Merge with Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board and Rustic Roads Advisory Committee.
- **Cable Communications Advisory Committee** - Revise its name and mission to bring it up-to-date; revised mission should include advising the Department of Technology Services as well as the County Executive and Council on broader technology issues, not just cable.
- **Committee for Ethnic Affairs** - Study merger with Committee on Hate Violence and the Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence - 3 B/C/C may not be needed.

- **Commission on Landlord Tenant** - Change Financial Disclosure Rules to ease recruitment.
- **Committee on Hate/Violence** – Absorb work of current Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence. Study merging this group with the Committee for Ethnic Affairs.
- **Community Action Board** –Recommended increases to travel and dependent care reimbursement should help with recruitment. Alternate positions should be abolished. The County Executive should have flexibility to appoint members to two or three year terms.
- **Citizens Review Panel Advisory Group** – Merge with the Citizens Review Panel.
- **Committee Evaluation and Review Board** – The next CERB should increase membership to 11 to have enough members for the two year task. Appointing the Chairs beforehand will reduce the amount of time needed to organize and start the evaluation.
- **Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee** – Business representatives should be able to apply directly to the County Executive.
- **Historic Preservation Commission** - The Council should consider adding enforcement power and the authority to impose fines to the Commission’s role.
- **Mental Health Advisory Committee** - Should be merged with Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council into a Behavioral Health Committee to align with the Department of Health and Human Services’ current organizational structure.
- **Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence** – Discontinue; this work should be done by a sub-committee of the Committee on Hate Violence.
- **Range Approval Committee** - Rename to reflect actual mission of Firearm Safety. The County Police Department should permanently assign the Range Officer as staff for this Committee and should allow the Committee to conduct safety inspections of the County Police Department’s ranges.
- **Sign Review Board** - Increase to 5 members. Amend zoning ordinance to transfer authority to approve minor variances to the Department of Permitting Services.
- **Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee** - Increase to 11 members to reflect the growing Silver Spring community.
- **Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee** – Discontinue, as it duplicates efforts by two other Silver Spring advisory groups.
- **Advisory Board on Victims and Their Families** - change the County Code to reflect the name that’s actually used—the Victim Services Advisory Board. Eliminate liaison positions from the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council and the Mental Health Advisory Committee.



An active and involved citizenry in the affairs of County government is a hallmark of life in Montgomery County. It is essential that the County government utilize this large volunteer resource in the most effective manner possible. It is in this spirit, to serve the County even better in the future, that the CERB has examined the current B/C/C structure and has made these recommendations to upgrade and improve the B/C/C system.

# **COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

## ***Review and Evaluation of Montgomery County's Boards, Committees and Commissions***

**Final Report  
2002-2004**

### **Members**

**Ms. Anita Brady  
Mr. Adrian Cargill  
Ms. Susan A. Cheney  
Mr. Michael J. Garr, Co-Chair  
Ms. Betsy W. Jett, Co-Chair  
Mr. Howard R. Philips  
Mr. Richard Stoll**

**July 2004  
Office of the County Executive  
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The members of the CERB wish to express their sincere gratitude to Debbie Goodwin, Special Assistant to the County Executive, and Kathy Zieger, Administrative Specialist, for their invaluable assistance to the CERB in its efforts over the last two years. Debbie and Kathy were instrumental in collecting and explaining the information needed by the CERB to perform its review and in providing other valuable background information on Montgomery County's system of boards, committees and commissions.

The CERB also wishes to express grateful appreciation to the following persons for their contributions to this project:

To the County Executive, Douglas M. Duncan, Chief Administrative Officer, Bruce Romer, Department Heads, many former and current Board, Committee and Commission (B/C/C) chairs, B/C/C members, and staff liaisons, and other county employees who took the time and effort to be interviewed, attend meetings, and complete surveys and questionnaires.

To Councilmember Marilyn Praisner, for meeting with the CERB co-chairs and providing direction and feedback regarding the CERB Charge and Interim Report.

To Shirley Kemelhor, a volunteer to the CERB, who took full responsibility for surveying nearby jurisdictions to determine how the County's board system compared to the board systems of these other jurisdictions, and to the jurisdictions that participated in the surveys.

To former members of the CERB -- April Hill-Addison, Jack Meltzer, Jacqueline D'Alessio, Michael J. Wilson, and Lucille Harrigan.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
 <b>CHAPTER I. CERB OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY</b>	
<b>A. CERB Charge</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. CERB Membership</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>C. Review and Evaluation Methods</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>D. Interim Report</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>E. Review of 1992 Committee on Committees (CoC) Findings and Recommendations</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>F. Survey of Committee System of Neighboring Jurisdictions</b>	<b>3</b>
 <b>CHAPTER II. GENERAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
<b>A. Citizen Participation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Membership and Diversity</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Recruitment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Application Process</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Length of Committee Service</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Attendance and Removal</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6. Compensation and Reimbursement</b>	<b>10</b>
 <b>B. Committee System Processes and Performance</b>	
<b>1. Notice of Meetings</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. Application of County Ethics Law</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3. Staffing</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4. Committee Operating Procedures</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Training</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6. Size</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7. Communications</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>8. Sunset Provisions</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>9. Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>24</b>

	<u>Page</u>
<b>CHAPTER III. SPECIFIC COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
<b>A. <u>Adjudicatory Boards, Committees and Commissions</u></b>	<b>25</b>
Animal Matters Hearing Board	26
Board of Appeals	28
Commission on Common Ownership Communities	29
Ethics Commission	30
Historic Preservation Commission	31
Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs	32
Merit System Protection Board	33
Sign Review Board	34
<b>B. <u>Licensing Boards, Committees and Commissions</u></b>	<b>35</b>
Board of Electrical Examiners	35
Board of License Commissioners	36
Board of Registration for Building Contractors	37
<b>C. <u>Program Direction</u></b>	<b>38</b>
Fire and Rescue Commission	38
Housing Opportunities Commission	39
Revenue Authority	40
<b>D. <u>Advisory</u></b>	<b>42</b>
Adult Public Guardianship Review Board	43
Commission on Aging	44
Agricultural Advisory Committee	45
Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board	46
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council	46
Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board	47
Cable Communications Advisory Committee	48
Charter Review Commission	49
Citizens Review Panel for Children	50
Citizens Review Panel for Children Advisory Group	51
Commission on Child Care	51
Commission on Children and Youth	52
Community Action Board	53
Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs	54
Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission	55
East County Citizens Advisory Board	56
Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee	57
Committee for Ethnic Affairs	58

	<u>Page</u>
Committee Evaluation and Review Board	58
Facilities Implementation Group	59
Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee	60
Committee on Hate/Violence	62
Commission on Health	63
Human Rights Commission	63
Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities	64
Commission on Juvenile Justice	65
Library Board	66
Mental Health Advisory Committee	67
Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board	68
Noise Control Advisory Board	69
Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence	70
Commission on People with Disabilities	70
Range Approval Committee	71
County-Wide Recreation Advisory Board	72
Area Recreation Advisory Boards	73
(Upcounty, Mid-County, Western MC, East County, Silver Spring)	
Rustic Roads Advisory Committee	73
Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board	74
Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee	75
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee	76
Board of Social Services	77
Solid Waste Advisory Committee	77
Taxicab Services Advisory Committee	78
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board	79
Advisory Board on Victims and Their Families	80
(also known as the Victim Services Advisory Board)	
Water Quality Advisory Group	81
Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board	81
Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee	82
Commission for Women	83
<b>E. <u>Other Boards, Committees and Commissions</u></b>	<b>83</b>
Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors	84
Board of Investment Trustees	85
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee	86
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors	87
<b>CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>88</b>

## **APPENDIX**

<b>APPENDIX A.</b>	<b>CERB Interim Report, June 13, 2003</b>
<b>APPENDIX B.</b>	<b>2003-2004 Amended Listing of Boards, Committees and Commissions Included or Excluded from the CERB Review</b>
<b>APPENDIX C-1.</b>	<b>B/C/C Staff Questionnaire</b>
<b>APPENDIX C-2</b>	<b>B/C/C Chairs Questionnaire</b>
<b>APPENDIX C-3</b>	<b>B/C/C Members Questionnaire</b>
<b>APPENDIX C-4</b>	<b>B/C/C Department Head Questionnaire</b>
<b>APPENDIX D-1</b>	<b>Survey Summaries of Neighboring Jurisdictions – Survey Questions</b>
<b>APPENDIX D-2</b>	<b>General Findings of Neighboring Jurisdictions Survey</b>
<b>APPENDIX D-3</b>	<b>Specific Findings from Survey of Neighboring Jurisdictions</b>
<b>APPENDIX D-4</b>	<b>Table showing B/C/C in Montgomery County and B/C/C In Neighboring Jurisdictions</b>
<b>APPENDIX E</b>	<b>Table showing Adjudicatory, Licensing, and Program Direction B/C/C Proposed to Receive Compensation</b>

## **CHAPTER I.**

### **CERB OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

This document constitutes the Final Report of the 2002-2004 Committee Evaluation and Review Board. The CERB, which previously was called the Committee on Committees (“CoC”) was created in 1977 by Council Resolution No. 8-1487 and was subsequently codified under Montgomery County Code Section 2-146(b). The CoC was convened by the Montgomery County Executive every five years; however, Montgomery County Council Bill No. 39-96, effective May 15, 1997, amended the law, and required the CoC be convened every ten years. Previous CoC final reports were issued in January 1979, May 1986, and December 1992.

#### **A. CERB CHARGE**

The duties and responsibilities of the CERB were to review and evaluate the current system of Montgomery County (“County”) boards, committees and commissions (hereinafter referred to as “B/C/C”). Following its review, the CERB is to recommend to the County Executive and to the County Council changes to individual B/C/C and the County committee system as a whole. The CERB’s charge identified specific issues to be addressed, including the number of B/C/C, the recruitment process, compensation and benefits, attendance, training, staffing, cost/benefit, and removal of members. A copy of the CERB’s charge is included in the Interim Report (Appendix A).

Certain state established committees, ad hoc committees, and recently formed B/C/C, were excluded from this study. An updated list of B/C/C reviewed by the CERB and those excluded from its review are found in Appendix B.

#### **B. CERB MEMBERSHIP**

The Montgomery County Executive (the “County Executive”) issued a news release soliciting members of the CERB on October 1, 2001. The County Executive appointed the original nine CERB members on March 6, 2002. The Montgomery County Council (the “County Council”) confirmed all appointments on March 19, 2002. Two vacancies created by resignations were filled in September 2002, and another vacancy created by resignation was filled in September 2003. One subsequent vacancy was never filled, and an additional resignation occurred in March 2004. The CERB completed its work with seven active members. There were five resignations received over the course of two years.



## C. REVIEW AND EVALUATION METHODS

The CERB has met regularly since March 2002 to gather information, analyze and evaluate B/C/C and produce this report. The CERB held forty-one meetings over the course of the last 27 months. The CERB set out to learn about the B/C/C appointment process, develop initial data gathering tools for its review methodology and attend meetings to record observations. Initial meetings focused on achieving an understanding of the County's system of B/C/C. Guest speakers, most of whom were current or former County employees, attended the early CERB meetings to provide useful background information on the County B/C/C system. Other reports and documents that provided background information included: The 1992 CoC Report; February 1999 DHHS Internal Review of B/C/C; 2001 staffing survey summary and October 2001 Training Needs Analysis, both conducted by Ronald Clarkson, former Community Relations Manager; July 28, 2000, Report of the Compensation Task Force; Policies and Procedures for B/C/C; Montgomery County Code: Chapter 2, Article XI, Sections 2-141 through 2-148, and other related materials.

With the help of the County Department of Technology Services staff, the CERB developed a web-based survey designed to gather basic information about each B/C/C, which surveys were completed by staff liaisons. In addition, CERB members attended meetings of each B/C/C under review.

The CERB conducted interviews with former and current chairs, vice chairs, and members of B/C/Cs, department heads, staff liaisons, and others. The interviews focused on issues such as attendance, compensation, staff support, member diversity, adherence to mission/purpose, and overall effectiveness. The interview questions for B/C/C staff, chairs, members, and department heads are attached (**Appendices C1 – C4**). The CERB conducted a survey to compare the system of B/C/C in Montgomery County to those of neighboring jurisdictions.

The CERB interviewed the following former and current department heads and other County employees and persons familiar with B/C/C operations:

Wayne Busbice, former Chair, 1992 Committee on Committees  
Greg Baylor, Director, Department of Recreation  
Carolyn W. Colvin, Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)  
Elizabeth Davison, Director, Department of Housing and Community Affairs  
David W. Edgerley, Director, Department of Economic Development  
Albert J. Genetti, Jr., former Director, Department of Public Works and Transportation  
George Griffin, Director, Department of Liquor Control  
Marc Hansen, Chief, Division of General Counsel, Office of the County Attorney  
Robert Hubbard, Director, Department of Permitting Services  
Bruce Romer, Chief Administrative Office  
Odessa Shannon, Exec. Director, Human Rights Commission  
Charles Short, former Director, Dept. of Health and Human Services  
Ronald Clarkson, former Community Relations Manager  
Robert K. Kendal, former Director, Office of Management and Budget

Gail Nachman, former Chief Policy Officer, Dept. of Health and Human Services  
Kate Garvey, Service Chief, Dept. of Health and Human Services  
Felicia Turner, Executive Director of the Community Action Agency, DHHS  
Winifred Wilson, Social Services Officer, Dept. of Health and Human Services  
Jay Kenney, Service Chief, Department of Health and Human Services  
Daryl Plevy, Service Chief, Department of Health and Human Services  
Dr. Ulder Tillman, Health Officer, Department of Health and Human Services

The 68 B/C/C reviewed by the CERB were divided among the CERB members, with each member primarily responsible for conducting the interviews, attending meetings, and developing preliminary recommendations for between seven and nine B/C/C. Some of the B/C/C had more than one CERB member participate in the information gathering so that there was more than one member's perspective to consider when developing recommendations for that particular B/C/C. The full CERB reviewed and discussed the preliminary recommendations for the individual B/C/C. All CERB members unanimously supported all final recommendations for the individual B/C/C, as well as all recommendations concerning the total committee system, committee process and policy and the committees in general.

#### **D. INTERIM REPORT**

An Interim Report (Appendix A) was sent to the County Executive and County Council in June 2003 to apprise them of the CERB's methodology and progress and to present the CERB's interim recommendations at the mid-point of its review. On September 4, 2003, the CERB's co-chairs, Michael Garr and Betsy Jett, met with the Management and Fiscal Policy Committee of the County Council to present the Interim Report and discuss preliminary recommendations. The County Executive and County Council gave verbal feedback of their approval of the Interim Report's recommendations.

#### **E. REVIEW OF THE 1992 CoC FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CERB reviewed the findings, recommendations and actions taken based on the CoC's 1992 report that are relevant to 2004 report. Many of the CERB's recommendations are similar to those suggested in 1992, and some even duplicate un-implemented recommendations from that time.

#### **F. SURVEY OF COMMITTEE SYSTEM OF NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS**

The CERB conducted a telephone survey of six nearby jurisdictions located in Maryland and Virginia with the goal of determining the number of committees in these other jurisdictions, and how Montgomery County's committee system compared with the committee systems of these other jurisdictions.

The table below identifies the jurisdictions surveyed, and the total number of boards, committees and commissions in each of the jurisdictions surveyed.

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Number of Boards, Committees, and Commissions</b>
Anne Arundel County	44
Baltimore County	35
Howard County	34
<b>Montgomery County</b>	<b>83</b>
Prince George's County	51
Fairfax County	73
Arlington County	42

As shown in the table, Montgomery County has more B/C/C than any of the other surveyed counties. Appendix D1 – D4 provides summaries of this research.

## **CHAPTER II.**

### **GENERAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter presents the 2002-2004 CERB's general findings and recommendations. The chapter covers materials that relate to the committee system as a whole, to County policies and practices relating to the committee system, and to committees generally.

#### **A. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION**

The volunteer committee system provides the County government with important community input, expertise and diverse points of view that may not be available with the County's own staff. The B/C/C system has created a network of groups and individuals who are involved in and committed to a strong local government. Department heads and executive leaders in government all expressed this concept as one of the main benefits of the committee system. However, this network of residents, professionals, business entities and other stakeholders does not reflect fully the changing demographics of the County. The CERB is concerned about ways to engage and involve groups that are under-represented or not represented in the B/C/C system.

Montgomery County has more B/C/C than any of the other counties surveyed in the Washington, D.C. area. A successful B/C/C system of this size is dependent upon broad resident participation and requires an efficient recruiting system to maintain a willing and enthusiastic core of volunteer members.

##### **1. Membership and Diversity**

Findings. In order to present balanced points of view, membership should reflect a cross-section of citizens who are consumers, industry representatives, or technical experts as appropriate to the nature and function of the committee. The appointing authority must consider diversity of background and professions, relevant experience and expertise and geographic, gender and ethnic balance. The County is fortunate to have so many residents eager and ready to serve on B/C/C. However, as the demographics of the County have changed, the diversity of the County's B/C/C has not kept up. Although we recognize that efforts have been made to improve diversity, many committees still find it is difficult to recruit members who reflect the diversity of the County. In particular, many members, chairs and staff have stated that they have difficulties recruiting applicants from ethnic minorities, low and moderate income, new immigrants, young adults, and people with disabilities, despite concerted efforts to recruit their participation. Some reasons for these difficulties have been identified by the Chairs and Staff members. They include financial hardships that limit the ability to pay for transportation or child care, as well as English language limitations and cultural behaviors that inhibit participation in community activities outside their own cultural group. Given that the County now has a 40% minority population and 41% of the County's population is foreign-born, strategies to increase diversity on B/C/C must be

developed and implemented. In addition, it is also difficult for many B/C/C to fill slots that require very specific technical or subject matter expertise or credentials. In some cases, a position may remain vacant for months or even years because of narrowly-defined membership categories.

#### Recommendations.

a. Diversity. The CERB recommends a more active and intense outreach to community groups, business associations, and other organizations that provide services to the under-represented populations. Additionally, the CERB is recommending an increase in the reimbursement for travel and dependent care expenses associated with serving on a B/C/C because the current levels may be a barrier for low-to-moderate income residents' ability to serve on a B/C/C (see Compensation Recommendations).

b. Specific Membership Categories. Define membership categories (consumer, industry, technical expert) in broad terms. Provide recruitment guidelines as goals for member categories instead of absolute requirements. Allow the appointing authority discretion in selecting candidates who will provide balanced perspectives when membership goals for a particular category cannot be met. This flexibility will allow committees to function at full membership, even in times when it is difficult to recruit for a particular category. When specific subject matter expertise cannot be recruited, consider use of temporary consultants who participate on the committee on an as-needed basis.

## 2. Recruitment

Findings. Vacancies for executive branch B/C/C are announced as follows: A news release authored by the Offices of the County Executive is issued by the County's Office of Public Information, placed on the County's website, and sent via an electronic eSubscribe list to which individual residents and organizations may subscribe. Information from these releases are often (but not always) published in The Gazette and The Washington Post (Montgomery Extra section). The releases are also sent to all County libraries and Regional Services Centers for posting. In addition, the County Cable Channel may announce these vacancies. Recent modifications have been made on the County's website to link news release notices to the website for Volunteers - Boards, Committees and Commissions. The legislative branch has its own procedure for filling vacancies. News releases are issued and the County Council interviews applicants.

News releases published by the local newspapers have proven to be an effective method for reaching a broad range of applicants for some B/C/C, but for others this method is not enough. For example, vacancies for narrowly-defined slots may require a more focused recruitment approach in order to reach qualified potential applicants. As stated in the Interim Report, the more narrowly-defined the position, the harder it may be to fill. B/C/C members and staff often assist with recruitment efforts, especially to interest groups and individuals who have expressed a willingness to serve. In some cases, these recruitment activities still remain inadequate.

Approximately 21 B/C/C have other interest groups, such as Chambers of Commerce, the Maryland Municipal League, or Citizens Advisory Boards, that must nominate a candidate to a particular B/C/C. This process becomes cumbersome if these groups do not follow through with their nominations in a timely manner and may even become burdensome to the nominating organizations. Additionally, it may cause confusion for applicants.

Recommendations.

a. A concerted effort to research additional avenues for publishing the vacancies needs to be undertaken and more outreach done to inform the public of opportunities to serve on B/C/C, including holding information sessions on how to become a member of a B/C/C.

b. Staff liaisons of B/C/C should take a more active role in assisting with member recruitment, especially in cases where there is a narrowly-defined membership vacancy (e.g., master electrician, member of the clergy, or veterinarian or veterinary technician).

c. Additionally, some relaxing of very specific membership categories of certain B/C/C and simplifying the process for nominations would be helpful. When a new committee is established, an attempt should be made to avoid specific categories of membership and membership slots that require a nomination from an outside group.

d. Additional outreach strategies are needed to increase diversity and numbers of applicants.

**3. Application Process**

Findings. The standard application procedure for B/C/C membership requires submission of a letter of interest and an accompanying resume to the County Executive (or in some instances, the County Council). Most B/C/C chairs and staff members surveyed prefer this method because it allows the applicant to state interests, talents and expertise that they would bring to the particular B/C/C. In 2004, the Offices of the County Executive began accepting e-mail applications and the County Executive's e-mail address is now included in the news releases announcing vacancies. Additionally, changes to the County's website make it easier for people interested in serving on B/C/C to apply directly via a link to e-mail, to link to the news releases, and to receive vacancy notices through eSubscribe.

Once the recruitment is completed, applications are sent to the B/C/C staff liaison, with instructions regarding the interview and nomination process. A nominating committee is reminded to consider diversity (ethnicity, gender and geography) when making its recommendations to the County Executive. Additionally, nomination recommendations are made by listing applicants in priority order, so that when a future vacancy occurs, it will be easier to go back to the prioritized list to identify the next highest recommended nominees. The CERB appreciates the County Executive and County Council approving its Interim Report recommendation to extend the six-month period for "original recruitment" to twelve

months. This new policy should assist in filling vacancies more quickly when there is a pool of candidates who have already been interviewed and are willing to serve.

The typical timeline for recruitment until appointment is approximately four months. The timeline is based on an average recruitment period of 3 to 6 weeks, an interview timeframe of approximately 4 to 6 weeks, and 2 weeks to review recommendations and hold discussions with the County Executive. Then the Council part of the process is an additional 2 weeks or longer if the Council is in recess (Confidential Memo, then appointments sent, then names are listed on the Council agenda and confirmed at the next Council session). The usual interview procedure requires that a nominating committee of the B/C/C and staff conduct interviews of all non-incumbent applicants. In cases where there are large numbers of applicants, the interviews can take several weeks to complete. A change in procedure may be necessary in the future should the number of applicants ever become so large that conducting individual interviews becomes too cumbersome and time-consuming to complete. Some B/C/C have a history of taking several months to complete the applicant interviews and recommendation process.

#### Recommendations.

a. To facilitate the application process for residents who may not have a resume, the County should provide an optional standardized application form. The form should be easy to complete and should be made available in hard copy and online. It is recommended that staff of the Offices of the County Executive or County Council assist anyone who has difficulty applying for a B/C/C.

b. Staff liaisons of B/C/C should encourage and assist the nominating committees to complete interviews and make timely recommendations to the County Executive.

#### **4. Length of Committee Service**

Findings. The membership term for most of the B/C/C is three years, and members are limited to serving two consecutive full terms. However, if the initial appointment is for a partial term of less than two years, that member may be re-appointed twice. This potentially allows for a member to serve close to eight years. The CERB recognizes that it may take time for new members of a B/C/C to become educated in the issues or work of the B/C/C and it is beneficial for members to serve a second term so that there are “seasoned” members with organizational memory. However, after completing two terms, the CERB believes that it would be beneficial for that member to step down to allow for wider participation by County residents and an enhancement of ideas and energy in that committee and the B/C/C system. Waivers to the two-term limit are considered on a case-by-case basis. For instance, if a B/C/C is unable to fill a narrowly-defined slot, a member who has served effectively in that position may seek appointment to a third term. In most cases, however, a third term should not be granted if there are other qualified applicants willing to serve.

Recommendation. The existing practice of B/C/C members serving two terms and the granting of waivers of term limits on a case-by-case basis should be continued. A further

expansion of this policy is recommended to provide that an outgoing member who serves two terms must complete a three-year waiting period before re-applying to serve on the same B/C/C. In most cases, members who serve two terms would benefit from and should be encouraged to participate on a different B/C/C, so as to foster the sharing of ideas and expertise.

## **5. Attendance and Removal**

At the behest of the County Executive, the CERB reviewed the policy and procedures of all B/C/C regarding removal of members.

Almost all B/C/C members are subject to the County regulation providing for the “automatic resignation” of a B/C/C member who is absent from 25% or more of the B/C/C scheduled meetings or hearings during any six-month period. The policy currently states “unless the law expressly provides another method to remove members for absenteeism, a member of a committee who is absent from 25% or more of the scheduled meetings or hearings during any 6 month period has resigned from the committee.” [Montgomery County Code Section 2-148]

When a member resigns through absence, the Chair of the B/C/C must promptly notify the appointing authority and all members of the B/C/C. The appointing authority may waive the resignation for illness, emergency, or other good cause. This provision of law is not consistently applied across B/C/C. For instance, some B/C/C stated they were not aware of the law, while others allowed “excused absences” for a variety of reasons.

There was no uniformity among B/C/C with regard to enforcement of the attendance policy. Members and staff of the B/C/C raised many concerns regarding the current attendance policy. A few B/C/C expressed concern that the attendance policy does not provide the flexibility they need to accomplish their goals. Attendance at meetings may not accurately reflect an individual member’s level of participation and contribution. Some B/C/C would prefer that member removal for failure to comply with the attendance policy be at the discretion of the Chair, while others would like to see the percentage of missed meetings used to trigger removal be greater than 25%.

Less than ten B/C/C have distinct policies and procedures in place for removal of a member for reasons other than failure to comply with the attendance requirements. These other reasons include neglect of, or inability to perform, the duties of the office, misconduct in office, or serious violation of law.

### **Recommendations.**

a. The CERB recommends that the Montgomery County Code be changed to accommodate a uniform removal policy for all B/C/C that authorizes the removal of members for certain circumstances and establishes a process for the removal of a member of a B/C/C (see Interim Report, Appendix A).



b. The CERB further recommends that, to be fair and consistent within all B/C/C, a phased approach be applied to the various B/C/C who hold different numbers of scheduled meetings throughout the year. This policy would apply to meetings of the full B/C/C.

<b>Number of Meetings held in One Year</b>	<b>Allowed Absences</b>
1 – 4	1
5 – 8	2
9 – 12	3
13 – 16	4
17+	5

c. An additional recommendation is that any member who misses three consecutive meetings at any time during the year will also be in violation of the attendance policy.

d. The appointing authority should retain the ability to waive this attendance provision, as in current law.

e. The CERB recommends that this new attendance policy be enacted for all B/C/C and that the new policy be addressed in the training sessions held each year for members and staff of the B/C/C.

## **6. Compensation and Reimbursement**

**Findings.** As noted in the Interim Report, the Board of Appeals, the Board of Electrical Examiners, the Board of License Commissioners, the Fire and Rescue Commission, and the Merit System Protection Board financially compensate their members. The Montgomery County Planning Board, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and the Washington Suburban Transit Commission/Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority also financially compensate their members, but these entities are not part of the CERB study.

The CoC reported in 1992 that the various committees charged with important licensing functions are dealt with differently in staffing and compensation. The CoC recommended that a uniform standard be established and implemented to bring these committees in line with one another. As discussed below, the CERB discovered that the Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C are not treated equally in terms of compensation of their members.

The County Council established the Compensation Review Task Force on November 23, 1999, to review the compensation of the County's eight paid boards and commissions. The task force was appointed on February 22, 2000, and submitted its report to the County Council on July 28, 2000. The task force recommended that for certain board and commissions, the compensation be increased, while for other board and commissions, the compensation remain at the then current rate. In addition to salary, the task force considered

other methods of compensation, such as reimbursement of expenses and participation in the County government's deferred compensation plan. The County Council's Management and Fiscal Policy Committee ("MFP") held a work session on September 25, 2001. The MFP agreed with many of the task force's recommendations. The County Council adopted some of the recommendations of the task force.

In its Interim Report, the CERB suggested criteria that should be considered in attempting to create an equitable, criteria-based compensation program, across all B/C/C, and within each eligible B/C/C, including: (i) annual work load; (ii) professional skills involved; (iii) nature of responsibilities; (iv) compensation received by a comparable board in a neighboring jurisdiction; (v) compensation received in the open market for performing comparable work; and (vi) difficulty in filling vacancies.

After careful consideration, and based on the results of the survey of the surrounding jurisdictions (described in Chapter I), the CERB recommends that the primary criteria to be examined should be the following:

- (i) annual work load of the members;
- (ii) professional/technical skills required of the members;
- (iii) complexity of issues handled by the B/C/C;
- (iv) nature of responsibilities (i.e., mission and function) of the B/C/C; and
- (v) whether the B/C/C has historically had difficulty in recruiting members.

The differences between the paid and unpaid Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C with respect to these five factors are negligible.

#### Recommendations.

a. The CERB recommends that, in order to create an equitable, criteria-based compensation program, all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C be compensated in an equal manner. In reaching this recommendation, the CERB carefully considered the following:

- (i) The nature and complexity of the work performed by the Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C;
- (ii) Many members of the uncompensated B/C/C volunteer for membership because they want to give something back to their community, or they want to learn new skills, or gain experience in an area covered by the mission of a particular B/C/C;
- (iii) The reason that many of the compensated B/C/C are able to attract and retain qualified members is due, in part, to the amount of compensation paid to their members;
- (iv) Many of the Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C perform operational functions that would otherwise be the responsibility of County employees; and

- (v) County law currently precludes a member of a compensated B/C/C from receiving reimbursement for travel and dependent care.

b. The CERB recommends that compensation for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C be changed to the following:

- (i) for all regularly-scheduled meetings lasting four hours or less, a payment of \$60.00 per meeting for members (including attending alternate members) and \$80.00 for chairs.
- (ii) for all regularly-scheduled meetings lasting more than four hours, a payment of \$120.00 per meeting for members (including attending alternate members) and \$160.00 for chairs.

Compensation should not be paid for meetings of subcommittees or other unofficial meetings. The effective date for these compensation changes for incumbents members should be the next time that a board member or chair is appointed.

The compensation figures are based on, among other things, compensation paid to members of other state or local boards, committees and commissions performing functions similar to those performed by the County's Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C.

It is estimated that the budget for compensating all Adjudicatory, Licensing, and Program Direction B/C/C will be under \$200,000. This amount is approximately \$75,000 less than the total amount that is currently being paid to the compensated B/C/C. A table showing the current compensation levels for the compensated B/C/C and the compensation levels as recommended by the CERB (along with a description of certain other conditions and assumptions) is attached as Appendix E.

c. The County Code provision for compensating members of B/C/C (Article XI, Section 2-145), states, among other things, that if a committee member is not compensated for serving on the committee, the member may request reimbursement for travel and dependent care. The CERB recommends that this law be changed to provide that compensated committee members be eligible for reimbursement for dependent care. The CERB recommends that reimbursement for travel and dependent care be increased to the following:

\$10 per meeting for reimbursement of travel  
\$30 per meeting for reimbursement of dependent care

d. The CERB further recommends that the level of compensation for Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C be re-examined every five years, with the first such re-examination to occur by the CERB in 2012.

The CERB recognizes that, by implementing the above recommendations regarding compensation, members of a few B/C/C will be negatively impacted if and when that compensated member is re-appointed. We had to balance this reality with our goal of trying to create an equitable compensation system, i.e., equal pay for equal value.

e. The CERB recommends that the County continue its practice of not compensating members of advisory B/C/C (other than reimbursement for travel and dependent care expenses). The CERB recognizes that all volunteers devote many hours their committees and bring specialized knowledge that is essential to the County. However, these B/C/C have a primary advisory function and do not perform operational functions that would otherwise have to be performed by County employees.

f. The County should explore the possibility of providing additional benefits to B/C/C members, such as free Ride-On bus passes.

## **B. COMMITTEE SYSTEM PROCESSES AND PERFORMANCE**

The mission and purpose of each B/C/C is described in its authorizing legislation. Although most B/C/C are highly effective at fulfilling their mission, the CERB has observed that some seem to drift from their prescribed purpose. These B/C/C may be operating with mission statements that are no longer relevant to the needs of the County, or they may plan agendas that do not tie in to their mission. The CERB feels that review by all B/C/C of their mission during orientation and annual training would serve to remind members of the mandated reason for the existence of the committee.

The CERB observed that B/C/C effectiveness is also dependent on receiving clear direction, timely information and constructive feedback from County staff in terms of goals and objectives that are achievable and of value to County government. In some cases, advisory B/C/C are not aware of specific issues and initiatives that are underway. As a result, valuable advice is either not obtained, or is obtained late in the process of design or implementation of a new initiative. This creates an environment where the B/C/C are reactive rather than pro-active in making recommendations. Departmental managers should provide clear direction and actively seek the timely advice of B/C/C regarding issues that are of concern or that are in the planning stages for future action. In addition, each B/C/C should develop an annual operational plan to proactively address issues of importance to the County government and the constituents it represents.

Specific aspects of B/C/C processes and performance are discussed below.

### ***1. Notice of Meetings***

Findings. To make interested parties aware of upcoming meetings and comply with the Maryland Open Meetings Act (“Open Meetings Act”), B/C/C meeting dates, times and locations are posted on the County’s website (under Boards, Committees and Commissions, Meeting Calendar) and in the Executive Office Building Terrace Level, on the

bulletin board outside the cafeteria. This calendar also lists subcommittee meetings of the B/C/C. The B/C/C calendar is also attached monthly to the County Council meeting agenda. Some B/C/C staff may occasionally fail to provide notice of their group's meetings and, thus, not all meetings are published.

Recommendation. Staff liaisons need to be reminded to notify the Offices of the County Executive of regular and subcommittee meeting dates, times and locations so they can be announced.

## **2. Application of County Ethics Law**

Findings. The potential for conflict-of-interest will always be of concern to the B/C/C system. This condition exists because members of B/C/C are, in effect, public employees. A member could possibly make decisions or recommend a path of action that could have a positive financial impact on the member or the member's family. Accordingly, the County Public Ethics Law ("Ethics Law") address conflicts-of-interest. These laws are summarized in the County handbook titled, "Policies and Procedures for Citizen Boards, Committees and Commissions," dated July 2001.

The Ethics section of the Handbook includes a paragraph noting that its description of the Ethics Law is only a general overview. Where appropriate, the Ethics Commission may be asked for an advisory opinion or a waiver.

Conflict-of-interest problems may be anticipated or minimized by raising the relevant issues early in the selection process of committee members and by discussing them during committee meetings. The committee chair and staff should try to develop conflict-of-interest examples for training purposes that are relevant to its activities.

### Recommendations.

a. Include on the standard membership application a section for disclosure of potential conflict-of-interest, with a statement that completion of this section is mandatory. The presence of a potential conflict-of-interest would not preclude appointment to the committee, however, it but must be disclosed.

b. Design and ask questions during interviews with applicants that will identify real or potential conflicts-of-interest.

c. Remind committee chairs that they are responsible for conducting their committee in compliance with the Ethics Law. The committee chair, in turn, should raise the issue several times during the year, with examples that relate to the committee's activities.

d. Enforce the rule that any member with a conflict-of-interest must recuse himself or herself from discussion and voting on the related issue. If that member does participate in such an issue, the County Attorney or the Ethics Commission should be advised and asked about appropriate action.

- e. A section of B/C/C training must include discussion of conflicts-of-interest.

### **Financial Disclosure Statements**

**Findings.** Certain County employees and volunteers are required to file financial disclosure statements. The Ethics Law and a supplemental Executive Regulation specify who must file, and whether their disclosure is public, confidential or confidential with limited public review. The forms are identical; however, the public forms may be viewed by the general public, the confidential forms may be reviewed only by authorized government personnel, and the confidential with limited public review allows for only certain sections of the form to be disclosed to the public.

The Montgomery County Ethics Commission is the agency responsible for receiving Financial Disclosure Statements. In the most recent three years reported by the Ethics Commission, approximately eighty persons filed public financial disclosure statements and 1100 persons filed confidential disclosure statements. Members of twenty of eighty-three B/C/C are required to submit the financial disclosure statements.

Starting with the 2003 reporting period, electronic filing became the standard mode of submitting the financial disclosure statement. Under County law, if someone is required and refuses to file, he or she may be removed from membership on a B/C/C.

The financial disclosure form consists of thirteen sections, with several of them inapplicable to B/C/C members. Among the twenty B/C/C, there are two variables: type of filing and required date of filing for initial disclosure. The numbers of each are as follows:

<u>Type of Filing</u>	<u>Number</u>
Confidential	12
Confidential with Limited Public Review	4
Public	4
<u>Date of Filing</u>	<u>Number</u>
Within 15 Days of Confirmation	15
Before Council Confirms	1
As Part of Application	4

**Recommendations.** The CERB recommends that the financial disclosure filing requirement for the four B/C/C that requires **applicants** to complete a form as part of their application, be changed to only require the filing within fifteen days following confirmation of appointed members, and annually thereafter. The four B/C/C are: the Cable Compliance Commission, the Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs, the Merit System Protection Board and the Board of Appeals. This change would make it easier for individuals to apply to the respective commissions. Interview questions must be asked of applicants to determine the existence of real or possible conflicts-of-interest prior to appointment.

### 3. Staffing

Findings. Adequate and competent staffing is crucial to the success of B/C/C in carrying out their missions. The level and type of support that Staff Liaisons provide varies widely from B/C/C to B/C/C. A survey of Staff Liaisons performed in January 2002 by the County's Community Relations Manager showed that Staff Liaisons who provide primary support to a B/C/C spent an average of approximately 25% of their working time on that committee's activities. An additional 100 County employees each contribute an average of four hours per week to assist B/C/C. In a few cases, only clerical support is provided to a B/C/C. When a new B/C/C is created, there is usually no new allocation of human resources to staff it; the support comes from existing County personnel who take it on as an additional job responsibility.

Recommendations. The CERB recommends the following regarding B/C/C staffing:

a. ***Opportunities for more efficient use of Staff Liaisons.*** The former Director of the County's Department of Health and Human Services suggested that the Department might be able to improve support with the same number of personnel if one employee staffed more than one B/C/C. This may have the added benefit of improved communication between B/C/C with overlapping or related agendas.

b. ***Human resources requirements for new B/C/C.*** Staffing and other operating costs should be an important consideration when creating new B/C/C. B/C/C should not be created until a careful examination of staffing and operating costs are completed to ensure adequate personnel and financial support and a clear mission and vision for the B/C/C that does not overlap with existing B/C/C purpose and goals.

c. ***Staff Liaison Training.*** Staff liaisons must have the knowledge and tools they need to provide support effectively. At the suggestion of Staff Liaisons during a recent training initiative, the County Executive's office is now hosting a monthly "brown bag" meeting to encourage sharing of knowledge, ideas and best practices regarding B/C/C support. The CERB applauds this effort as a promising way for Staff Liaisons to improve and learn continuously. Evaluation comments from these brown bag sessions indicate Staff Liaisons are identifying opportunities to improve the B/C/C system as a whole, networking with other Staff Liaisons, learning from each other, and proactively identifying areas for mutual collaboration and partnership among B/C/C.

d. ***Level of Staffing and Staff Responsibilities.*** B/C/C members, Staff Liaisons, and County Department managers should have a common expectation for the level of support provided. Professional level staff support (Grade 21 and above) should be provided to all B/C/C, and clerical support should also be assigned. The B/C/C Policy and Procedures Handbook sets forth the basic level of support that should be provided to a B/C/C. Staff Liaisons should be encouraged to follow this guidance.

#### **4. Committee Operating Procedures**

Findings. Almost invariably, the CERB found that committee operating procedures were significantly improved over the conditions reported by the 1992 CoC. The CoC recommendations for operating procedures have been incorporated in a County Handbook titled, "Policies and Procedures for Citizen Boards, Committees and Commissions," dated July 2001. Due to budget limitations, the Handbook is no longer published; however, it is available on the B/C/C website under the title "Policy and Procedures" and "Council Policy Regarding Appointment." Nonetheless, some staff liaisons were not aware of all pertinent information contained in the Policies and Procedures Manual.

The eleven factors cited in the 1992 CoC report are being observed or taken into consideration to a large extent, but they are repeated here because they are so basic. Each of these issues should be discussed at orientation sessions:

1. Keeping and filing of minutes.
2. Requirements for meeting notices and quorums.
3. Orientation and training of new members.
4. Annual report of activities and accomplishments.
5. Standards of ethics.
6. Conduct regarding conflicts-of-interest
7. Policy concerning member compensation.
8. Policy concerning reimbursement of expenses.
9. Relations with County departments and staff.
10. Policy on attendance.
11. Procedures for testifying.

Although not an inherent aspect of operating procedures, the mission and purpose of each committee should also be reviewed at least annually. The CERB has observed a "drifting" away from the prescribed purpose of several committees, and feels that review by all B/C/C of their mission would serve to remind members of the mandated reason for the committee's existence.

#### **Recommendations.**

a. Staff and committee chairs should make more extensive use of the Policies and Procedures Handbook, and funds should be budgeted to allow for continued printing of this Handbook. At least one committee meeting a year should have committee operations as an agenda item and the information contained in the Handbook should be reviewed at that time. Committee members should be encouraged to ask questions and to contact the Ethics Committee or the County Attorney if there are unresolved issues relating either to committee operations or to conflict-of-interest or any other aspect of the Ethics Law.

b. The County Executive's Office should maintain a program to identify and share the best practices of committee operations. One way to accomplish this goal would be to sponsor periodic meetings between staff and chairs of B/C/C with related missions or similar



functions, so that each B/C/C would participate in a “best practices” meeting every two or three years.

## **5. Training**

**Findings.** Although a majority of B/C/C provide a new member orientation, the orientation content is not consistent throughout the B/C/C. Some B/C/C provide an orientation packet to all new members, other B/C/C hold a one-time annual new member orientation, and other B/C/C have periodic new member orientation programs when a new member joins. During the recruitment and appointment of new members training program first held in January 2003, the County distributed a handout titled, “Orientation of New Members.” This resource included a description of information and documents to distribute to all new B/C/C members as part of orientation. Participants in these training programs expressed a need that all B/C/C new member orientation programs must include required information such as the requirements of the Open Meetings Act or the Ethics Law. In addition, existing members of B/C/C should be provided any recent updates on existing policies and procedures. Several B/C/C also held annual member retreats or planning sessions that served as an orientation, training, operational planning and evaluation process for new and existing B/C/C members. These sessions allowed for informal networking and group development to help members focus on priorities, learn about new or revised policies and proactively address concerns and issues the B/C/C needed to address in the upcoming operational year.

B/C/C members and Staff Liaisons believe that overall training for B/C/C needs to be more accessible. Training surveys indicated that training should include computer-based instruction, web seminars, electronic newsletters and e-mails of articles with policy updates and relevant training tips. In addition, some B/C/C members expressed a desire to include County training updates for B/C/C within their regularly scheduled meetings to provide more access to training efforts for all B/C/C members.

The County has implemented training for B/C/C leadership, members, and staff liaisons. The following topics have been covered in the B/C/C training program to date: the Ethics Law and the Open Meetings Act, the B/C/C recruitment and appointment process, running effective meetings, enhancing staff and chair working relationships, and dealing with contentious people. Positive participant evaluations have been noted, and on-going revisions to the program are being made to ensure practical application of the topics covered in the training. Additional training for B/C/C members in response to their expressed needs is planned throughout the remainder of 2004. It is important to note that these training opportunities have all been implemented without any additional funds being allocated.

### **Recommendations.**

a. The CERB recommends continuing the monthly “Brown Bag” networking sessions for staff liaisons of the B/C/C so that they may continue to share best practices and lessons learned. A similar session for B/C/C Chairs should be offered on a semi-annual basis.

b. The CERB recommends that all B/C/C orient new members to their specific B/C/C mission, goals, policies and priorities, and annually review revised B/C/C goals, policies and procedures for existing members. This could be accomplished as part of an annual operational planning and committee training meeting or retreat.

c. The CERB recommends that County staff consider non-traditional forms of training through use of e-mail, websites and other strategies to make training more accessible for all B/C/C members and staff liaisons. For example, a quarterly electronic newsletter could be sent to members and staff liaisons to provide updates in relevant policies and procedures, best practice sharing from B/C/C, and articles that provide practical information that can assist members and board leadership in participating most effectively as a member or a leader in their own B/C/C. Another example is “Training in a Box.” These are specific written training program materials, an instructor guide and audiovisual material that is developed and loaned out to boards. Sample topics could include, “Orientation to the County Government Operations,” “Understanding Your Role as a Member of a Montgomery County Board” and “Developing Effective Leadership Skills as a New Board Leader.”

d. The CERB recommends that the County continue to provide training to Staff Liaisons and B/C/C members, and **commit the financial and human resources** to support the continued implementation and future growth of a formalized training program. The CERB also recommends expanding training opportunities.

e. The CERB suggests an expansion of the County’s training program for B/C/C to include the following six areas:

i. **Basic Responsibilities** – The training would explore the basic responsibilities of B/C/C, including a discussion of the B/C/C mission and purpose, a review of County policies and procedures and a review of member and Staff Liaison roles and responsibilities. Additionally, the training should encompass the role of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations.

ii. **Structure and Practices** – The training would include practical guidelines on structural issues such as running meetings, subcommittee and executive committee structure and size, parliamentary procedure basics, decision making, bylaws review and communications (formal and informal).

iii. **Budget Responsibilities** – The training would provide B/C/C members with an understanding of the County’s organizational structure and how the County’s Operating and Capital Improvement Program (“CIP”) budgets are developed, including related timeframes. The goal of the training would be to help B/C/C better understand how the Operating and CIP budget process works, and how each B/C/C can provide input into the process.

iv. **Leadership Roles** - B/C/C members would learn strategies for effective meeting facilitation and leadership to allow them to build a cohesive team. This training clarifies the difference between the multiple roles on

B/C/C, including member, Chair and Staff Liaison. Members would also discover ways to manage group processes effectively.

v. **Legal and Ethical Responsibilities** - All B/C/C members should understand their B/C/C legal responsibilities and member responsibilities under the Open Meetings Act and the Ethics Law, including conflicts-of-interest. These topics are included in the training program recently implemented and should be continued.

vi. **Recruitment, Selection and Interview Techniques** - This training would teach strategies to increase a member's confidence and competence in interviewing and recommending the best candidates for his or her B/C/C. It will also cover the process and procedures developed by the County Executive's office in these areas. Members will learn to avoid asking illegal or inappropriate interview questions, and will be reminded that their role in the process is an advisory one.

## 6. Size

Findings. The CERB has reviewed the size and membership structure of B/C/C to determine whether changes in the number of members, and/or the use of executive committees and/or subcommittees, may lead to that B/C/C operating with greater effectiveness.

The majority of B/C/C have memberships in the range of 5-15 voting members, with various combinations of numbers of alternate, ex-officio and non-voting members. For B/C/C in this size range, size was not as significant a factor in B/C/C effectiveness as were leadership skills of the chair and the level of staff support.

However, as noted in the Interim Report, small B/C/C may run into the problem of members participating in informal meetings in violation of the Open Meetings Act. Another potential problem is the inability to conduct official business at scheduled meetings if one or two members are absent (i.e., failure to have a quorum). Large B/C/C with Chairs who do not have strong leadership and meeting management skills may have their own challenges, such as difficulty in running their meetings and reaching a consensus on certain issues.

There are currently two B/C/C with only three members: Sign Review Board and Merit System Protection Board. There are 20 B/C/C with more than 15 **voting** members:

<b>B/C/C</b>	<b>Voting Members</b>
Advisory Board on Victims and their Families	18
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council	16
Cable Communications Advisory Committee	13 to 19
Commission on Aging	18+
Commission on Child Care	18
Commission on Children and Youth	27
Commission on Health	19
Commission on Juvenile Justice	23
Commission on People with Disabilities	25
Committee for Ethnic Affairs	26
Community Action Board	27-39
County-Wide Recreation Advisory Board	20
Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee	26
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee	25
East County Citizens Advisory Board	18
Mental Health Advisory Committee	19
Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board	18
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors	21
Solid Waste Advisory Committee	16
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board	20

The larger B/C/C operated with different levels of efficiency, with size being just one factor in their ability to function effectively.

Recommendations. The CERB recommends that any new B/C/C created have 5-15 voting members, to facilitate the efficiency of the group.

Whenever a larger (i.e., more than 15 voting members) B/C/C is needed, the appointing authority and/or the B/C/C should try to appoint a Chairperson with experience in managing large groups.

Recommendations on increasing the size of the Sign Review Board, the Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee and the Committee Evaluation and Review Board are set forth in the individual B/C/C recommendations below.

## **7. Communications**

Findings. The CERB found a wide discrepancy among the numerous B/C/C with regard to communicating with the public, media, elected officials, other B/C/C and with each B/C/C's own members. Interaction and sharing of information between B/C/C is lacking. This lack of interaction means that the County is not receiving the full benefit of the time and energy being invested by staff and members.

Annual reports are not filed by a majority of B/C/C. While there are some B/C/C with websites and a good use of the website with regard to posting of agendas, minutes and other information, most B/C/C do not have websites.

To facilitate the interaction between the B/C/C and all of the interested parties, the County needs to develop a set of common communications procedures, forms and distribution channels.

Many B/C/C, but not all, have taken advantage of new technologies to distribute information, including web sites, Internet chat rooms, and the County e-mail system. Some B/C/C do not use any of these technologies. The long term effectiveness of the B/C/C system is dependent on the ability of all participants to communicate effectively. The County has the technology and the know how to bring every B/C/C into an electronic information system that takes full advantage of creation, storage and accessing of information now available to only a few.

#### Recommendations.

a. The County has a knowledgeable staff in its Department of Technology Services, who have access to many technological resources. The CERB recommends that the County Executive task the Department of Technology Services to create a “master communications plan” for B/C/C, that will identify both short-term and long-term communications goals and funding levels to achieve the goals. This plan should incorporate the use of e-mail, websites, internet chat rooms and any other technology that would facilitate the B/C/C operations.

b. There is a need for B/C/C to develop and utilize common communications procedures for dealing with the public, media, elected officials, other B/C/C, within the B/C/C and any sub-committees and with County and state government. Such procedures should include:

- Creation of a uniform template for B/C/C use in connection with the County’s annual reporting requirement. Input from County Council and the County Executive on the form and content of the template should be sought.
- Creation of an online application to facilitate B/C/C recruiting.
- Establishment of a formal channel for communications between the County’s Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and all B/C/C. This would ensure that the County is informed about recommendations and proposed actions being considered by B/C/C that may impact the County’s message to state officials.

c. Upgrade and update the B/C/C database created by the CERB to serve as a permanent repository of B/C/C information.

d. Post documentation of B/C/C activities online on the County website. The documentation can include items such as meeting minutes, annual reports, position papers and other materials generated by the B/C/C. This would enhance communication with the

public, between committees and across intra- and inter-governmental agencies. Links to individual B/C/C websites should be made available from the Volunteers – B/C/C website where all B/C/C are listed.

e. All B/C/C should be held accountable for submitting an annual report. The annual reports should include a detailed description of productivity and performance over the preceding year, recent and ongoing activities, including a discussion of any major recommendations and/or initiatives, and goals for the next year. A template should be developed with County Executive and County Council input so there is uniformity in B/C/C annual reports.

## **8. Sunset Provisions**

Findings. The County does not have an effective means to assess periodically the purpose and mission of committees once they have been established. As a result, committees may continue indefinitely with missions that no longer meet the needs of the County government or its residents. As new issues emerge, the first response is often to create a new committee rather than to expand the charge of an already existing committee. The committee system could eventually expand beyond the County's ability to support it.

### Recommendations.

a. The CERB recommends establishing staggered sunset provisions for all B/C/C that are not mandated by State or Federal government. Under this proposal, a committee is automatically terminated 5 years after the date it is established unless:

- i. The statutory authority that established the committee provides for a different duration;
- ii. The appointing authority terminates the committee earlier because it has fulfilled its purpose or is no longer carrying out the purpose for which it was created; or
- iii. The appointing authority renews the committee for another five years.

b. The following information should be provided to evaluate the establishment or renewal of a committee:

- i. Explanation as to why the committee is needed, including its relevance to the mission of the department and the public interest.
- ii. Explanation as to why the committee's functions cannot be performed by government staff, another existing committee or through other means such as public hearings.
- iii. For renewal of an existing committee, a description of the major activities that the committee has engaged in over the last five years as reflected in the annual reports and how those activities furthered the goals for which the committee was established.
- iv. For the establishment of a new committee, the objectives and scope of the committee, the authority to whom the committee reports, the agency

responsible for providing support, specific duties of the committee, the estimated annual cost in dollars and man-hours to operate the committee, estimated frequency of meetings and the membership plan to ensure adequate, balanced representation.

## **9. Cost Effectiveness**

Findings. In most cases, the cost associated with operating a volunteer B/C/C is absorbed by the department with no line item for committees in the budget. For most departments, the major cost is for staffing support. The government officials we interviewed agreed that the intangible benefits of the committee system are well worth the cost.

The CERB found that there is no consistent policy within the County departments for budgeting the true cost of staff support, even though a 2002 study found that B/C/C averaged 77+ hours of staff time per month. With all 83 B/C/C requiring some level of staffing, this is the equivalent of 37 full-time staff positions. Assuming the average cost of \$56,756 per employee – the County is spending over \$2.1 million on supporting the B/C/C structure. Although the CERB feels this money is well spent, the costs should not be hidden within Departmental budgets.

Recommendation. The CERB recommends that each County department and agency include a separate line item in its annual Operating Budget for staff support, travel reimbursement and dependent care reimbursement. The CERB believes this open disclosure of the actual costs of B/C/C support will lead departments to consolidate staff support and increase the use of technology, which will have the added benefit of increasing communications.

## CHAPTER III.

### **SPECIFIC COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This Chapter presents the Specific Findings and Recommendations for each of the 68 B/C/C reviewed and evaluated by the CERB. This presentation is the culmination of the efforts of CERB members and reflects careful and serious consideration of all the facts and information available to the CERB.

From time to time the County Executive and County Council appoint ad hoc B/C/C to assist in the study of specific or timely issues. The CERB did not review any of these ad hoc committees and therefore has no recommendations for such committees.

The B/C/C will be presented and categorized as follows:

- A. **Adjudicatory.** Each B/C/C that, as its major function, makes rulings based on factual and legal matters.
- B. **Licensing.** Each B/C/C that, as its major function, issues licenses, permits, or other regulatory approvals.
- C. **Program Direction.** Each B/C/C that, as its major function, administers, operates, or approves government programs.
- D. **Advisory.** Each B/C/C that, as its major function, consults with and gives recommendations to one or more units of County government.
- E. **Other.** B/C/C that are not included in any of the above categories.



## **A. ADJUDICATORY BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS**

Each B/C/C that, as its major function, makes rulings based on factual and legal matters is an adjudicatory B/C/C. Included in this category are the B/C/C listed below; a review and evaluation of each follows.

Animal Matters Hearing Board  
Board of Appeals  
Commission on Common Ownership Communities  
Ethics Commission  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs  
Merit System Protection Board  
Sign Review Board

\* \* \*

### **ANIMAL MATTERS HEARING BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 5-104.

Purpose -- To decide on complaints and appeals under MC Code Chapter 5, Animal Control, including complaints alleging a violation of an animal control shelter adoption contract; recommend standards to maintain regulated facilities; review the annual proposed budget for the animal control shelter to the Executive and the Council; and report annually to the Executive and Council on the Board's activities and any recommendations for improving animal control laws, regulations, and programs.

The Board may: (1) Order the Director of Animal Control to seize, impound, destroy, or take any other action the Board decides is necessary regarding an animal that is suffering cruelty, is dangerous or potentially dangerous, or is causing a public nuisance or other violation of Chapter 5. (2) Specify conditions under which an owner may keep an animal that the Board finds has suffered cruelty, is dangerous or potentially dangerous, or caused a public nuisance or other violation of Chapter 5. (3) Require an owner to forfeit an animal to the County or prohibit the owner from harboring an animal in the County. (4) Impose conditions on an owner harboring other animals in the County. (5) Revoke or suspend a facility's license for a violation of Chapter 5. (6) Appoint a person to mediate a case if the owner and each complainant (which may include the Animal

Services Division) agree. A consent order resulting from mediation is an order of the Board. If the mediator or the Board finds that the parties are not likely to agree to a mediated consent order within a reasonable time, the Board must decide the case. (7) Order the owner of an animal to pay actual damages (including medical or veterinary expenses) not exceeding \$1,000 to a person injured or aggrieved by the animal's actions or behavior.

Membership -- 5 members and one alternate for each member: - (a) a veterinarian or veterinary technician; (b) a representative of the Montgomery County Humane Society; (c) three public members, including a representative of licensed animal fanciers. The term for each alternate is the same as that for the primary member.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential disclosure required.

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- 2-4 Meetings per month, approximately 1.5 hours each (3-5 members attend hearings)

Compensation -- None

Comments -- This is a very hard working, dedicated, and effective Board. There have been significant recruitment problems in the past due in part to the many hours of work required for participation and the hard to fill veterinarian or vet technician category. Hearings could last several hours and there is significant additional workload required for case review prior to meetings.

The caseload can be very demanding, and depends in part on the level of effort from the Animal Services Division (ASD) staff to resolve issues before they reach the AMHB. The current Animal Services Division (ASD) director has provided excellent leadership and ASD staff are more focused on resolving problems in the field, and in using mediation as the first option. The Board had high praise for staff that provides logistical support, scheduling of meetings, coordination, and takes the first call on complaints. The staff member takes the time to help callers resolve their problem on their own, so that it doesn't have to go to the AMHB. This approach has had significant positive impact on the Board. While a veterinarian could provide valuable input, this need could still be met if the position were converted to ad hoc status that allowed attendance on an "as needed" basis instead of carrying a full workload and time commitment. Board members suggested that another way to improve recruitment and retention would be to promote pride in service, recognize members for their service, and increase the visibility of the AMHB through newsletter articles and other means. Additional mechanisms to recognize members for their service are suggested. An annual report has not recently been published.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours;

\$80/meeting for chairs). Management policies and practices that have been implemented under the current ASD leadership should be institutionalized to ensure continued high level of support and responsiveness. The County should consider restructuring the Board so that technical expertise from a veterinarian is available on an as needed basis. An annual report should be published.

## **BOARD OF APPEALS**

Created -- Sections 2-108, Montgomery County Code

Purpose -- The Board of Appeals has authority to hear and decide certain land use issues including special exceptions for uses not otherwise permitted in the particular zone; variances from the setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; and Administrative Appeals from actions of the County Government (as specified by the County Code). The Board has countywide jurisdiction, except for the municipal corporations of Brookeville, Poolesville, Laytonsville, Rockville, Barnesville, Gaithersburg and Washington Grove.

Membership -- Five members, all of whom shall be residents of Montgomery County. Not more than three members of the Board shall be from the same political party. Members are appointed by the County Council.

Financial Disclosure -- Public Financial Disclosure statement required; all applicants must also complete the financial disclosure form when applying.

Terms -- Four years

Meetings -- Four meetings per month, approximately 5 hours each

Compensation -- \$18,615 Chair; \$12,999 members (does not reflect July 2004 CPI-U)  
Compensation is adjusted every July, and is tied to the CPI-U.

Comments -- Section 2-108 of the County Code requires the Council to ask the County Executive to recommend within 30 days one or more qualified applicants before making any appointment to the Board of Appeals. Neither the current nor the prior County Executive has ever opposed any applicant identified by the Council. The Board's decisions are frequently not written in the legally mandated time of 30 days or 45 days, depending on the type of case. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Continue. Final written decisions should be done in a timely manner. An annual report should be published. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).

## COMMISSION ON COMMON OWNERSHIP COMMUNITIES

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Section 10B-3

Purpose -- To advise the County Executive and the County Council on ways to handle common ownership of property in communities; promote public awareness of the rights and obligations of living in common ownership communities; eliminate disputes; and maintain property values and quality of life in community associations.

Membership -- Fifteen members consisting of: six residents of self-managed and professionally managed common ownership communities (including condominiums, cooperatives and homeowner associations); six members from the ranks of professionals associated with common ownership communities (attorneys, property managers, investor-owners); and three members from the category of real estate sales and developers. There are five ex-officio non-voting members from the following agencies: County Council, Planning Board, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Public Works and Transportation, and the Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential financial disclosure required

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- Monthly (2 hrs), plus 2 hearings per month for 2.5 hours (two members attend hearings)

Compensation -- None

Comments -- This dedicated group performs a valuable service and does a good job in arbitrating common ownership community issues and educating their leaders and members. There is no other Commission similar to this in the surrounding jurisdictions that were surveyed. No annual report is published; however, the Commission does issue at least one newsletter per year.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). An annual report should be published.

## ETHICS COMMISSION

<u>Created</u> --	Mandated by State law through Montgomery County Code Section 19A
<u>Purpose</u> --	Responsible for rendering advice on the County's Code of Ethics and for acting on requests for waivers from ethics prohibitions and outside employment. The Commission also investigates complaints.
<u>Membership</u> --	Five members - No more than three members may be of the same political party.
<u>Financial Disclosure</u> --	Public financial disclosure required. New appointees must complete the financial disclosure form before their appointment is confirmed by the County Council.
<u>Terms</u> --	Four years
<u>Meetings</u> --	Monthly for 2.5 hours
<u>Compensation</u> --	None

Comments -- The operations of the Ethics Commission that deal with personnel actions are inherently confidential. Non-confidential operations would include general discussions of the ethics law, financial disclosure and public policy. Because of the confidential nature of the discussions, the CERB member assigned to review the Ethics Commission could not sit in on any discussions of personnel actions.

The Washington D.C. sniper shootings and Police Chief Moose created a high profile case for the Ethics Commission. The Commission had to resolve the extent to which Chief Moose could perform certain commercial activities and be paid for those activities within the scope of the Montgomery County Ethics Law. This had to be done in the context of keeping its deliberations confidential but making public the results of those deliberations.

The Ethics Commission prepares an Annual Report. Printed copies have been available through the year 2000. Starting with the report for the year 2001, the report has been available on the County's Website. The 2001 Annual Report is the most recent report available.

Recommendation --Continue. The CERB was not given adequate access to evaluate this Committee. The County Executive and County Council should address this problem before the next CERB is convened. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). The Annual Report should be up-to-date and published in a timely manner.

## **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 24A-4

Purpose -- Responsible for recommending historic sites and districts to the Planning Board for placement on the Master Plan for Historic Preservation. The Commission also acts on applications for alteration, construction or demolition of designated historic sites, and serves as a clearinghouse by reviewing proposals affecting historic preservation in the County.

Membership -- Nine members - at least one member representing each special interest, knowledge or training, in the fields of history, architecture, preservation and urban design. The remaining members are selected from applicants representing the various geographical, social, economic and cultural concerns of County residents.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential Disclosure required.

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- 2 meetings per month (approx. 4 hours each)

Compensation -- None

Comments -- The Commission is well run and its members and staff are very professional in handling approximately 180 cases per year. This Commission's most significant problem is the fact that it has no enforcement powers and there is virtually no checking after approval to see if the work was done per the permit. The County Executive and County Council should consider revising the enabling legislation to include enforcement powers and penalties. The additional cost of staffing for enforcement should be offset by penalty fines. An annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).

## COMMISSION ON LANDLORD-TENANT AFFAIRS

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 29-9

Purpose -- The Commission hears apartment license revocation appeals and landlord-tenant disputes.

Membership -- 12 members and 3 alternates (4 members and one alternate in each of three categories. Landlord category: Owner of a residential rental facility located in the County or manager or employee of a manager of a residential rental facility located in the County or nominated by an organization that represents owners or manager of a residential rental facilities in the County. Tenant category: Tenant of a residential rental facility in the County or nominated by an organization that represents tenants of residential rental facilities in the County. Public-at-large category: Person who does not own, manage, or work for a manager of a residential rental facility in the County and who is not a tenant of a residential rental facility in the County.

Financial Disclosure--Confidential disclosure required for members; all applicants must also complete the financial disclosure when applying.

Terms -- Three year terms

Meetings -- Monthly (2 hours), plus approx. 3 hearings per month lasting 2.5 hours (3 members attend each hearing)

Compensation -- None

Comments-- Currently confidential financial disclosure statements are required annually for members **and for all applicants**. This is viewed as a barrier for applicants. In the past, it has been difficult for the Commission to recruit and retain members from various ethnic groups and low-income residents to serve in the tenant category. Members and applicants have complained about the lengthy financial disclosure form and the difficulty in annually updating the forms. The Commission has been effective in writing decisions and orders which have been upheld by the Circuit Court. It also provides an impartial complaint process for landlords and tenants. The Board does not publish an annual report.

Recommendations- Continue with changes.

- CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).
- Change the existing rule so that applicants are not required to file financial disclosure statements when applying to serve on the commission. It is recommended that appointed members file financial disclosure statements within 15 days of their confirmation.

- Utilize questions in the applicant interview process to determine if an applicant has an actual or potential conflict-of-interest. If a case comes up that could be a potential conflict-of-interest, a member should recuse him/herself per the Ethics law.
- Shorten existing financial disclosure form and provide a more user-friendly online version of the form that is easier to complete.
- Design and implement specific outreach strategies to expand recruitment for more diverse representation, especially tenants.
- Increase transportation and dependent care reimbursement for board members to support existing board members and to encourage recruitment of residents with low to moderate incomes to serve on the board.
- Publish an annual report.

## **MERIT SYSTEM PROTECTION BOARD**

<u>Created</u> --	Montgomery County Charter, Section 403
<u>Purpose</u> --	The Board serves as an appeal body with respect to adverse personnel actions. The Board shall conduct on a periodic basis special studies and audits of the administration of the merit and retirement systems and file written reports of its findings and recommendations with the County Executive and the County Council. The Board shall comment on any proposed changes in the merit system law or regulations in a timely manner as provided by law.
<u>Membership</u> --	Three members appointed by the County Council. Members shall be qualified voters of the County and not more than two members shall be from the same political party. No member shall hold political office or participate in any campaign for political or public office during his term on the Board. Chairperson is elected annually by the Board.
<u>Financial Disclosure</u>	– Public disclosure required. All applicants must also complete the financial disclosure form when applying.
<u>Terms</u> --	Three years
<u>Meetings</u> --	2 meetings per month (for 3 hours); plus hearings 1-2 times per month, approx. 8 hours
<u>Compensation</u> --	Chair: \$8,314; Members: \$6,754 Compensation is adjusted every July, and is tied to the CPI-U



Comments -- Because the MSPB's work is highly technical and complex, compensation is provided to the members. The Merit System Protection Board produces an annual report, covering the fiscal year.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).

## **SIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 59-F

Purpose -- To review applications for sign permits and to grant variances from sign ordinance regulations, as provided in the ordinance.

Membership -- Three members - at least one member shall be an architect licensed to practice architecture in the State, and at least one member shall be a person operating a business in the County.

Financial Disclosure - Confidential disclosure required.

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- Monthly (3 hours)

Compensation -- None

Comments -- The 1979 Committee on Committees recommended consolidation into the Board of Appeals. This did not occur. The 1992 Committee on Committees noted that the consolidation could involve a conflict as citizens have the right to appeal a decision to the Board of Appeals. Concern was expressed to the CERB that the Sign Review Board has made mistakes by granting variances in matters in which they should not be granted, and not granting variances in matters in which they should be. The Board would benefit from more dialogue among members on the way the Board should carry out its statutory powers. Based on the seriousness of recent Board discussions on when variances should be issued, staff believes that the mission of the Board is not clearly defined. Due to the small size of the Board, it has had to cancel a number of meetings for failure to have a quorum. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Continue. The CERB recommends significant modifications to statutory structure.

- The size of the Board should be increased to 5 members.
- CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).
- The zoning ordinance should be amended to transfer authority for approval of minor variances from the Sign Review Board to the Department of Permitting Services. Appeals from decisions of the Department would be to the Board of Appeals. The Department of Permitting Services is willing and able to accept such responsibility for handling minor variances, and the Board of Appeals is willing and able to work with the Department to implement the new process.
- An annual report should be published.

## **B. LICENSING BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS**

Each B/C/C that, as its major function, issues licenses, permits or other regulatory approvals is a licensing B/C/C. Included in this category are those B/C/C listed below; a review and evaluation of each follows.

Board of Electrical Examiners  
Board of License Commissioners  
Board of Registration for Building Contractors

\* \* \*

### **BOARD OF ELECTRICAL EXAMINERS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 17-12.

Purpose -- To certify to the Director of the Department of Permitting Services whether an applicant for a journeyman electrician, master electrician, or master electrician's limited license is qualified to comply with the Montgomery County Electrical Code and to perform electrical contracts in the County.

Membership -- Five members - One member shall be the holder of a valid, current County master electrician's license; two members shall be active at the time of their appointment or shall have had previous experience as an electrical contractor, electrical contractor limited, or shall otherwise be technically qualified to determine proficiency in the electrical field; one member shall represent the general public; and, one member shall be a professional electrical engineer, duly registered and licensed in accordance with the requirements of state law.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential disclosure required.

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- 3 per month (3 hours each)

Compensation -- Chair \$4,689; Members \$3,654 (does not include July 2004 CPI-U)  
Compensation is adjusted every July, and is tied to the CPI-U.

Comments -- The Montgomery County Electrical Code requires that a journeyman be on site and supervise electrical work being performed. The Board of Electrical Examiners conducts tests (for a fee) in Montgomery County for the Journeyman Electrician license. The test is not available elsewhere in the State, and it is desirable to continue issuing this license. The State only gives licenses at the master electrician level.

Recruitment for new Board members is difficult. Two factors are cited: (1) four of the five members must be certified and licensed in the electrical field (or otherwise be technically qualified to determine proficiency in the electrical field) and (2) the amount of time that each member must commit preparing the tests, giving the test, and grading the tests. The Board prepares an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). The Department of Permitting Services should make recruitment a continuous process to include seeking the more general “technically qualified to determine proficiency in the electrical field” (Past recruitments have focused solely on active licensed and certified electricians).

## **BOARD OF LICENSE COMMISSIONERS**

Created -- Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 2B

Purpose -- Issue alcoholic beverage licenses to commercial establishments serving alcohol and impose penalties for violations of alcoholic beverage laws in the County.

Membership -- Five members. Not more than three from the same political party.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential financial disclosure required (with limited public).

Terms -- Four years

Compensation-- Members receive \$9,000 per annum; Chair salary is \$10,000.

Meetings-- Two full days per month on Thursdays

Comments-- The Board of License Commissioners reviews liquor license applications, issues licenses to sell alcoholic beverages, enforces the alcohol beverage laws with regular Police Department input, and conducts enforcement hearings which may result in the revoking of licenses and imposition of fines. The Board hearings entail detailed and sensitive questioning of new applicants, recent violators, staff inspectors and police investigators. These hearings function much like a courtroom with witnesses and testimony. There has been a problem with member tardiness at hearings causing disruption to the proceedings. The Board has not published an annual report; however, a State report which details the number of new and transfer licenses issued and revenues received by the Office of the Board of License Commissioners is completed monthly.

Recommendation-- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). It is strongly recommended that the Board develop a strict and enforceable rule regarding member tardiness at licensing and enforcement hearings. The Board should complete an annual report of its activities.

## **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR BUILDING CONTRACTORS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 31C-4

Purpose -- To certify to the Director of the Department of Housing and Community Affairs whether the applicant and the organization of the applicant are qualified to comply with the building code and laws of the County and State and to fully perform building contracts, and that the applicant should be licensed.

Membership -- Five members - no more than two members must be active in the residential construction field at the time of their appointment.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential disclosure required.

Terms -- Three years

Meetings -- Monthly (2.5 hours)

Compensation -- None

Comments -- This board uses an effective and fair process in its deliberations. An annual report is sent to the Department Director.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).

## C. PROGRAM DIRECTION

Each B/C/C that, as its major function, administers, operates, or approves government programs is a program direction B/C/C. Included in this category are the B/C/C listed below; a review and evaluation of each follows.

Fire and Rescue Commission  
Housing Opportunities Commission  
Revenue Authority

\* \* \*

### FIRE AND RESCUE COMMISSION

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 21-2

Purpose -- The Fire and Rescue Commission is responsible for developing effective, efficient and equitable fire, rescue, and emergency medical services County-wide, and provides the policy, planning, and regulatory framework for these services. The Commission also advises the County Executive and the County Council on any matter relating to fire, rescue and emergency medical services; adopts County-wide policies, regulations, standards, procedures, plans, and programs applicable to all fire, rescue and emergency medical services operations; establishes communication and dispatch procedures for emergency communications centers; establishes guidelines for curriculum and training programs for Fire and Rescue Service employees and volunteers; and adopts policies and programs to recruit and retain volunteers.

Membership -- Seven voting members. Members must be residents of Montgomery County and reside in various geographic areas of the County and have a variety of occupational backgrounds. Two members must be **volunteer local fire and rescue department personnel** (the Fire Board submits a list of at least 5 volunteer, non-career firefighters for consideration; if the County Executive does not select an appointee from that list, the Executive must explain to the County Council why.) Two members must be **County career fire/rescue personnel** (organizations composed of career fire or rescue personnel submit lists totaling at least 5 names of career firefighters or rescuers; if the County Executive does not select an appointee from that list, the Executive must explain to the County Council why.) Three members must be from the **public-at-large** and have no personal, family, or business connections with the County volunteer or career fire and rescue services. The Fire Administrator serves as the chair of the Commission *ex officio*, but has no vote.

Financial  
Disclosure --

Public financial disclosure is required.

Terms --

Three years

Compensation --

Members appointed on or after 11/21/2000 receive \$10,417; all other commissioners receive \$8,000 per year. There is \$1,500 per member per year allowed for expenses. (This amount does not include the July 2004 CPI-U)

Comments -- In 1998, the County created a Fire Administrator and a reorganized Fire and Rescue Commission (FRC) to formulate and implement policy for the Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service. The County also created both a career chief to oversee operations of paid firefighters, and a volunteer chief with administrative authority over the 19 volunteer departments. Legislation introduced in 2003 (Bill 36-03) and passed by the Council in May 2004 further reorganized the County's fire and rescue services, including the creation of a countywide fire chief. The role of the FRC was changed in the reorganization, limiting its role to approval or disapproval of policies proposed by the Fire Chief and to providing advice to policy makers and elected officials regarding the fire and rescue service. The Commission also will have a limited role in adjudicating volunteer personnel issues. These changes are effective January 1, 2005. At that time, the Fire Administrator's position will be abolished, and the Commission will be chaired by one of the three public members elected as chair by the Commission. The Commission does not currently publish an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue per the recently passed legislation. The CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). An annual report should be published.

## **HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION**

Created --

Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 44A, Section 2-102 (b).

Purpose --

The Housing Opportunities Commission is a public corporation chartered under Maryland law. HOC builds, owns, manages and finances housing for people of eligible income. The Commission can issue tax exempt bonds to finance multi-family rental housing and single family mortgages.

Membership --

Seven members. (A new Federal law, effective 10/99, required that at least one member of this Commission be a person "who is directly assisted by the public housing agency."). Members are required to be sworn in by the Clerk of the Circuit Court before their first meeting.

<u>Financial Disclosure</u> --	Confidential disclosure required.
<u>Terms</u> --	Five years
<u>Meetings</u> --	Monthly (3 hours)
<u>Compensation</u> --	None
<u>Comments</u> --	This Commission functions very well and members have a strong commitment to housing. The workload is demanding and time-consuming. No annual report is published.
<u>Recommendation</u> --	Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs). An annual report should be published.

## **REVENUE AUTHORITY**

<u>Created</u> --	Montgomery County Code Section 42-3
<u>Purpose</u> --	Constructing, improving, equipping, furnishing, maintaining, acquiring, and operating the following projects to be devoted wholly or partially for public uses: airports and landing fields; public housing projects; housing for special age groups; health and welfare facilities, including hospitals and sanatoria; bridges, toll bridges and tunnels; parks, swimming pools, arenas, stadium and recreational facilities; dams, impounding basins and flood control, water supply and sewage disposal projects; parking facilities of every type and description; highways, parkways, traffic distribution centers, and facilities necessary or incident thereto; and public transportation facilities and systems of every type and description, submit an annual report and publish annual operating budget.
<u>Membership</u> --	Five members who must be county residents. The Chairman is designated by the County Executive. In addition, the Chief Administrative Officer or the CAO's designee serves as an ex-officio non-voting member.
<u>Financial Disclosure</u> --	Confidential disclosure required (with limited public)
<u>Terms</u> --	Five years
<u>Compensation</u> --	None

Comments -- The Revenue Authority is a well functioning, smaller board whose members have longer terms of office to provide stability on financial decisions. An extensive annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB is recommending a uniform compensation plan for all Adjudicatory, Licensing and Program Direction B/C/C (\$60/meeting up to four hours; \$80/meeting for chairs).



## **D. Advisory**

Each B/C/C that, as its major function, consults with and gives recommendations to one or more units of County government is an advisory B/C/C. Included in this category are the B/C/C listed below; a review and evaluation of each follows.

Adult Public Guardianship Review Board  
Commission on Aging  
Agricultural Advisory Committee  
Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board  
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council  
Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board  
Cable Communications Advisory Committee  
Charter Review Commission  
Citizens Review Panel for Children  
Citizens Review Panel for Children Advisory Group  
Commission on Child Care  
Commission on Children and Youth  
Community Action Board  
Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs  
Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission  
East County Citizens Advisory Board  
Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee  
Committee for Ethnic Affairs  
Committee Evaluation and Review Board  
Facilities Implementation Group  
Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee  
Committee on Hate/Violence  
Commission on Health  
Human Rights Commission  
Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities  
Commission on Juvenile Justice  
Library Board  
Mental Health Advisory Committee  
Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board  
Noise Control Advisory Board  
Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence  
Commission on People with Disabilities  
Range Approval Committee  
County-Wide Recreation Advisory Board  
Area Recreation Advisory Boards  
(Upcounty, Mid-County, Western MC, East County, Silver Spring)  
Rustic Roads Advisory Committee  
Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board

Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee  
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee  
Board of Social Services  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee  
Taxicab Services Advisory Committee  
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board  
Advisory Board on Victims and Their Families  
Water Quality Advisory Group  
Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board  
Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee  
Commission for Women

**(Unless otherwise stated, the above B/C/C meet monthly, there is no compensation, terms are for three years and financial disclosure is not required.)**

\* \* \*

#### **ADULT PUBLIC GUARDIANSHIP REVIEW BOARD**

Created --

Maryland Annotated Code, Family Law, Section 14-402 (a).

Purpose --

Responsible for reviewing each public guardianship in the County at least every 6 months, including a review of the place of residence and health status of the ward, the guardian's plan for preserving and maintaining the future well-being of the ward, the need for continuation or cessation of the guardianship or for any plans in altering the powers of the guardian, and the most recent dates of visits by the guardian or the guardian's designee. Public guardianship is provided to adults who lack the physical or mental capacity to care for their basic daily living needs. Public officials are appointed as guardian of the person only if an alternative does not exist to ensure access to and provision of needed professional services sufficient to protect health, safety, and welfare. Each time that the review board reviews a guardianship, the review board submits a recommendation to the Circuit Court that the guardianship be continued, modified, or terminated.

Membership --

11 members - a professional from the Department of Health and Human Services; two physicians, including one psychiatrist from the Department of Health and Human Services; a representative of the Commission on Aging; a professional from a local non-profit social service organization; a public health nurse; an attorney; a professional in the field of disabilities; and a person with a physical disability. There are also two representatives from the public-at-large.

Comments -- This Board is mandated by State law and provides a critical independent review function for the County. The Board appears to be very effective and consistently completes reviews in a timely manner. The Board reviewed 111 cases for Fiscal Year 2004. Recruitment for specific professional member categories is sometimes difficult. Consideration should be given to advertising vacancies in professional newsletters and targeting local professional organizations to improve recruitment. A report is published every two years.

Recommendation -- Continue. The report should be published annually.

## **COMMISSION ON AGING**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-35

Purpose -- To research, assemble, analyze and disseminate pertinent data and educational materials relating to activities and programs which will assist in meeting the needs and solving the problems of the aging; to cooperate with public and private agencies, organizations and individuals in identifying and solving the problems of the aging; and to develop and conduct, as appropriate, in cooperation with county government, other services and programs dealing with the problems and needs of the aging. To review plans of primary concern to the aging that are developed by the county government. To develop an information and referral system for all services in the county related specifically to the needs of the aging. To institute and conduct educational and other programs, meetings and conferences to promote the welfare of the aging. To study and investigate by means of public or private meetings, conferences and public hearings, conditions which may result in unmet needs or in discrimination or prejudice because of age. To advise and counsel the residents of the county, the county council, the county executive and the various departments of county, state and federal governments on matters involving the needs of the aging, and to recommend such procedures, programs or legislation as it may deem necessary and proper to promote and ensure equal rights and opportunities for all persons, regardless of their age. To work to remove the unmet needs or discrimination or prejudice on the basis of age in such areas as housing, recreation, employment, education, community services and related matters.

Membership -- No less than 18. Members must be county residents; a majority shall be senior citizens. Membership shall include individuals who are or who have been active in business, industry, labor, community service, religion, welfare, and/or education, the professions and representatives of major organizations or agencies significantly concerned with the problems of aging.

Comments -- This Commission is highly effective at meeting its goals and provides valuable services to the county. It actively forms liaisons with other committees and organizations to ensure that the needs of the elderly are considered in all aspects of community life in a coordinated way. In addition to the dedicated and energetic work of its members, the Commission has excellent staff support. This commission has developed several best practices that could be shared with other committees. The Commission publishes an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. Continue to share best practices with other B/C/C.

## **AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Council Resolution No. 8-705

Purpose -- To advise the County Executive and the County Council on all matters affecting agriculture in Montgomery County.

Membership -- 15 members. Twelve members shall be bona fide farmers selected so as to be representative of the total farm community and three members shall have no direct financial interest in farming. At least one farm economist and one conservationist shall be included in the committee membership.

Terms -- Farmer representatives serve three year terms. Non-farmer representatives serve one year terms.

Comments -- With one-third of all the land in Montgomery County under agricultural designation, the role of agricultural boards is important. The current separate board structure for various agricultural issues does not offer the agricultural community enough opportunity to work together and/or to present a loud and clear voice to the County Executive and County Council regarding the health and well-being of the agricultural industry. There are a limited number of farmers who are able to participate on the various agricultural boards. There is no annual report published.

Recommendation -- A unified Agricultural Board with a broader mission and goals and topic related sub-committees would be a better use of staff time and allow for greater participation from the widest segment of the farm community. Merge with the other agricultural advisory groups (Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board and Rustic Roads Advisory Committee). An annual report should be published.

## **AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Section 2-504.1 of the Agriculture section of the Maryland Annotated Code 1977 and Sec. 2B-2 (b) of the Montgomery County Code

Purpose -- To advise the County Executive and County Council with respect to the establishment of agricultural districts and the approval of purchases of easements; to review the status of agricultural districts and land under easement; to promote preservation of agriculture.

Membership -- Five members - at least three of whom shall be owner-operators of commercial farms who earn 50 percent or more of their income from farming. All must be county residents. No member may serve for more than two consecutive full terms.

Terms -- Five years

Comments -- This Board has been effective in lobbying the state on agricultural preservation issues. Many of their issues overlap with the Agricultural Advisory Committee and the Rustic Roads Advisory Committee, and could be better served by being merged together to address like issues. The Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board is currently preparing its annual report.

Recommendation -- Merge Agricultural Advisory Committee, Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board and Rustic Roads Advisory Committee. It may be necessary to change State law to accommodate this change.

## **ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Sec. 24-41

Purpose -- To identify local alcohol and other drug abuse program needs; review the state alcohol and other drug abuse plan; assist in the development of an annual County alcohol and other drug abuse plan; recommend appropriate allocation of funds to support alcohol and other drug abuse programs after considering other available funding sources; promote alcohol and other drug abuse programs; conduct or participate in one or more public forums each year concerning alcoholism and other drug abuse; and issue an annual report to the County Executive, the County Council, and the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services by October 1 of each year.

Membership -- The Council consists of 16 voting members and 9 nonvoting members. The voting members include: four members of the general public that

reflect the geographic diversity of the County; an individual who is recovering from alcoholism or other drug abuse; a professional who treats alcoholism or other drug abuse; a professional who provides care to prevent alcoholism or other drug abuse; a person of high school age or younger; a person who represents the multi-cultural diversity of the County; a practicing physician; a pharmacist; a relative of an individual who is receiving care for alcoholism or other drug abuse; a member of the clergy; a member of the legal profession; a member of the County parent-teachers associations; and a member of the business community. The 9 nonvoting ex-officio members are designated by (1) the County Executive, (2) the County Council, (3) the Health and Human Services Department, (4) the Police Department, (5) the Montgomery County Public School system, (6) the Board of License Commissioners, (7) the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, (8) the Mental Health Advisory Committee, and (9) the Advisory Board on Victims and their Families (aka Victim Services Advisory Board).

Comments -- The Advisory Board on Victims and Their Families does not have a member available to serve as a nonvoting member to this Council. The Council publishes an annual report.

Recommendations -- Merge. It is recommended that the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council and the Mental Health Advisory Committee be combined into a "Behavioral Health" Advisory Committee. This will be in line with the current organization of the DHHS. It may be necessary to change State law to accommodate this change.

## **ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Maryland Annotated Code, Article 2B, Section 159C, Chapter 832

Purpose -- The Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board is responsible for reporting at least quarterly to the County Executive on recommendations for the improvement of alcoholic beverage control and enforcement activities in the County. The Board also advises on the operation of the Montgomery County retail liquor stores and the method of alcoholic beverage distribution from the standpoint of efficiency, service and convenience to the public.

Membership -- Five members - all members shall be residents of Montgomery County and registered voters, and only one shall be a bona fide holder of either a Class B or C beer, wine and liquor license in Montgomery County and only one shall be a bona fide license holder of any other class license in Montgomery County. Three ex-officio members: Director of Dept. of Liquor Control, Chief of Police, and the Chair of the Board of License Commissioners.

Terms -- Four years.

Comments -- The 1992 Committee on Committees Report noted that the County's internal Liquor Control Policy Committee has overall policy direction responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the Department of Liquor Control (DLC) and that the ABAB has little, if any, power or impact on the decision-making process. Current ABAB members expressed similar sentiments. The Director of the Department of Liquor Control believes that the ABAB could play an advisory role to his department. Recruitment at times has been difficult. A quarterly update for this Board is provided to the County Executive as required in Article 2B. No annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue (Mandated by state law). This Board should focus on the mission as it is written and the quarterly reporting requirement to the County Executive should be done through the DLC. The DLC should take the lead in fostering cooperation with the ABAB. The Board should be advisory to the Department. Membership should be expanded to include restaurant owners and the hospitality industry. The DLC's outreach coordinator should be encouraged to attend these meetings and regularly report on departmental initiatives in the areas of underage selling, restaurant code of conduct and licensee training initiatives, etc. An annual report should be published.

## **CABLE COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Section 8A-31, as amended

Purpose -- Assist the County in oversight of the franchise agreement and advise the County on use of the cable system and allocation of grants for public service.

Membership -- At least 13 and not more than 19 members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. Membership must include one representative selected by the Montgomery County Chapter of the Maryland Municipal League, one representative selected by the City of Rockville, and one representative selected by the City of Takoma Park. Chairperson and vice chairperson elected annually by the members. A person must not serve more than two consecutive terms as chairperson.

Financial Disclosure - Confidential disclosure required (with limited public for communications-related activities).

Comments -- According to members and staff, the CCAC has been contentious and ineffective for a number of years. CERB has also observed open hostility in meetings and inflammatory language on a non-county website. There are 3 root causes of the problems:

1. The nature of the telecommunications and cable business has dramatically changed since the initial legislation; the once clear lines between telecommunications services are gone. New technology has permanently blurred these lines. What a technology can do today and what it will do six months from now may be markedly different.
2. The mission that at one time may have been clear is no longer fully relevant in light of new technologies.
3. The appointees have not represented a demographic cross section of the County and many have come with personal agendas in conflict with the mission.

There is no written annual report.

Recommendation – Continue with significant changes.

The Council has taken the first step in correcting the problems with this committee by creating the Cable Compliance Commission to review and decide on consumer complaints about cable services.

- The name and mission of this Committee should be broadened to serve the County Executive, County Council, and the Department of Technology Services on all telecommunications issues, including subcommittees on cable and satellite issues, emergency response systems, telephone, internet issues, budgets and other relevant areas.
- A 15-member Committee with broad professional representation from the technology areas noted above is recommended.
- An annual report should be published.

## **CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION**

Created -- Montgomery County Charter Section 509

Purpose -- To study the Charter and report at least once to the County Council on its activities within one year after appointment. Commission reports shall be submitted not later than May 1 of every even-numbered year. The reports shall contain recommendations concerning proposed Charter amendments, if any.

Membership -- Eleven members who shall be residents of the County, five of whom shall be appointed from a list of names submitted by the County Executive. Not more than six members shall be of the same political party.

Terms -- Four year terms to coincide with the County Council's term of office.

Comments – Absenteeism of members has been a challenge for the CRC. Membership does not reflect the diversity of the County's population. The CRC reports to the County Executive and County Council during even numbered years as required.



Recommendation -- Continue. Increase efforts during the recruitment process to better inform applicants of time commitments and expectations for membership on the CRC. Expand recruitment for more diverse representation.

## **CITIZENS REVIEW PANEL FOR CHILDREN**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-49A (2001); Family Law Article 5-539.1.2 of COMAR

Purpose -- Implements State law regarding the local citizen review board; examine the policies and procedures of State and local agencies, and where appropriate, specific cases to evaluate the extent to which these agencies in the County are effectively fulfilling their responsibilities to implement the child protection standards and State plan under 42 USC section 5106a(b) and any other criteria that the panel considers important for the protection of children; report the Panel's findings to the Executive, the County Council, the State Citizens Review Board for Children, and the State Council on Child Abuse and Neglect; prepare and make available to the public a report summarizing the Panel's activities within 60 days after the end of each fiscal year; carry out other duties as requested to assist the County Department of Health and Human Services, the State Citizens Review Board for Children and the State Council on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Membership -- 9 members; the County Executive appoints 7 members. Up to 3 members may be members of the Commission on Children and Youth who are separately confirmed by the Council as Panel members. One member must be a County resident appointed under State law by (1) the State Citizens Review Board for Children; and (2) the State Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Each member of the Panel must be a volunteer who (a) exercises the member's own free will in all deliberations of the Panel; (b) acts independently of any outside influence, particularly the member's employer; does not represent any agency or organization; and is not a County or State employee, or spouse or domestic partner of an employee, whose participation would be inconsistent with County Council policies regarding appointment of government employees to boards, committees and commissions.

Comments-- The Citizens Review Panel for Children is quite new and has been working to set priorities and procedures. The State of Maryland has an active role in their activities. The Panel is asked to review child protection services in Montgomery County. The Panel sees their mission as identifying gaps in service delivery and making recommendations about improvements. The State has requested that they conduct detailed record reviews also. In order to do this, each member is required to attend a three day training session. About half of the group has been able to complete this training. The Citizens Review Panel for Children is in the process of preparing an annual report.

Recommendation – Continue (mandated by State law).

## **CITIZENS REVIEW PANEL ADVISORY GROUP**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-49A

Purpose -- Provide technical and professional advice to the Citizens Review Panel for Children regarding child protective services. Each member of the Advisory Group must have expertise in the prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect, such as child advocates, volunteers of the court-appointed special advocate program, attorneys who represent children, parent and consumer representatives, and health and human service professionals.

Membership -- 5 members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council.

Comments-- The Citizens Review Panel Advisory Group functions as an auxiliary group to the Citizens Review Panel and meets along with the Citizens Review Panel. The Advisory Group members are non-voting advisors who provide additional technical and professional advice to the Panel. The Advisory Group members may be County or State employees, which Panel members may not be. There is confusion regarding the two separate names (Citizens Review Panel for Children and the Citizens Review Panel Advisory Group) for a group that meets together. An annual report for this group is in process.

Recommendation -- Merge by formally folding this group into the Citizens Review Panel for Children for efficiency since the Panel and Advisory Group already meet together. The Advisory Group could remain non-voting members, if necessary.

## **COMMISSION ON CHILD CARE**

Authority-- Montgomery County Code Section 27-62

Purpose-- Advise the County Executive and County Council on policies, programs and services that enhance the community support for high quality, affordable and accessible child care, address child care needs, and recommend priorities to improve services in support of child care.

Membership-- 18 voting members and 5 to 7 non-voting members. (a) Seven members are providers of child care services. The Executive should appoint providers of different types of child care services and providers to different age groups. These include family child care providers, group child care providers, private educational institutions, and providers serving infants, toddlers, pre-school and school-age children, and children with special needs. (b) Five members are parents of children receiving child care services. (c) Five members are selected from the business community and the general public. (d) One

member represents the Montgomery County chapter of the Maryland Municipal League.

The Superintendent of Schools, the Chairman of the Montgomery County Planning Board, the President of Montgomery College, or their designees, are nonvoting members of the Commission. Two designees of the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services are also nonvoting members of the Commission. In addition, upon recommendation of the Commission, the Executive may designate representatives of up to 2 public agencies to serve as nonvoting members. The Executive may appoint these additional members to serve less than three-year terms. Each member must reside or work in Montgomery County.

Comments: This Commission has well-run meetings. It strongly advocates on behalf of issues impacting child care in Montgomery County. There is a continued need to expand recruitment for more diverse representation. Members indicated a need for increased dependent care and transportation reimbursement to assist child care providers and parents who are on a limited income to attend meetings. An annual report is published.

Recommendations: Continue. Expand recruitment for more diverse representation, especially for parent and child care provider categories. Implementation of the CERB's recommendation to increase travel and dependent care costs should help attract members.

## **COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-48

Purpose -- To advise the County Executive and County Council, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Board of Education on the development of coordinated community and government policies, programs and services which support children, youth and families.

Membership -- 27 members including one representative from the public school system; one representative from the private schools in the County; one representative from the Department of Recreation; and two representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services. The remaining 22 members are from private agencies and schools, parents of youths, and high school students.

Terms -- 3 year terms for parents and agency representatives; one year terms for youth (June 1 – May 31).

Comments-- The mission of the Commission on Children and Youth is very broad, but does focus on the issues of school age children, in particular those “at risk.” The Commission reviews, comments on and advocates for items in the budgets of the County’s Department of

Health and Human Services and the Montgomery County Public Schools. This board informs officials on the needs of children, youth and families, gaps in services, as well as suggests funding priorities. It also provides community feedback. With a committed Chair and involvement of the membership, this Commission works well in meeting its yearly priorities and initiatives. An annual report is published.

Recommendation-- Continue. This Commission should develop a close relationship with the Collaboration Council. The Collaboration Council should be requested to seek out the input of this Commission and to invite the members to participate in their decision-making process.

### **COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-41

Purpose -- Develop and coordinate community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The board advises the County Executive and the County Council on matters relating to the needs of the poor.

Membership -- No more than 39, or less than 27 members from designated organizations and geographic areas. At least 1/3 of members represent low-income persons in the County, and 1/3 are public officials or their representatives. The balance are representatives from business, industry, labor, religious, private welfare, private education, minority, civic, and other major private organizations.  
*Alternates may be appointed for the low-income and private organization representatives.* Note: Only low-income reps must be residents of the County.

Terms -- Public officials serve at the pleasure of the County Executive. Low-income and private organization members serve four (4) year terms. (These members must not serve on the Board for more than five (5) consecutive years or ten (10) total years.) Alternates serve the same terms as their primary representative.

Comments --

- The Community Action Board members and staff are dedicated to the mission of the Board.
- The Board operates under Federal, State and County guidelines which are complicated and cumbersome. For instance, Federal guidelines state that members must not serve on the Board for more than five consecutive years or ten total years. The County Code requires that members be appointed to four year terms. Time served as an alternate counts the same as that of a regular member which may prevent

the alternate from ever serving as a primary member. A person appointed for a full four-year term cannot be reappointed under these Federal guidelines.

- This Board has difficulty finding low-income representatives. Section 27-41, Section 3 – Low-Income Representatives of the County Code states that “The Board must establish a democratic procedure for low-income residents to select candidates for nomination, each of whom must live in a specific geographic area of the County. Individuals participating in the selection of a candidate must be at least 18 years old, reside in the specific geographic area of the County, and have income that does not exceed the limits established under subsection (d).” The process of conducting these community elections for the low-income representatives has been cumbersome. Lack of interest, lack of time, inability to travel (reliable transportation and/or bus schedules) to meetings, and related travel and dependent care costs have all been cited as barriers to recruitment in this category.
- The FY 2001 Annual Report (dated October 1, 2002) is the most recent annual report issued.

**Recommendations:** Continue. Alternate positions should be abolished. Implementation of the CERB’s recommendation to increase travel and dependent care costs should help attract members. The County Executive should have the flexibility to appoint members for two or three-year terms so that members can serve two terms without exceeding the Federal guideline of not serving more than five consecutive years. The Community Action Board should publish an annual report.

## **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 11-3.

Purpose -- The Committee is to advise the Department of Housing and Community Affairs in carrying out its duties and functions and hold public hearings as deemed necessary.

Membership -- Nine members - at least two from the Better Business Bureau or another County-wide association of merchants, at least two from the Community Action Board (one representing the economically disadvantaged), and five from the community at large.

Comments-- During the monthly meetings the Committee discusses with staff members the projects the Division of Consumer Affairs is currently pursuing or may pursue in the future. The Committee members also discuss projects they themselves are pursuing. Several Advisory Committee members regularly volunteer at the Division to assist the staff with their projects. The Advisory Committee is empowered to hold public hearings, but it has never done so. The Committee consists of a dedicated group of volunteers who regularly contribute to the Department. No annual report is prepared.

Recommendation -- Discontinue as a County appointed group. The Division of Consumer Affairs should continue to recognize this network of volunteers as a Division resource and to utilize their efforts in support of the staff in their work.

## **CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COMMISSION**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 2-60

Purpose -- To inquire into the organization and adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice; develop standards and recommendations for the long-range development of programs within the criminal justice system; and coordinate the programs and activities of criminal justice agencies. The Commission also performs an advisory role on crime control and other public safety matters of interest to the government and the community.

Membership -- 26 members total (twenty are ex-officio). Six members are appointed by the County Executive--three representatives of the public-at-large having specialized knowledge and dedicated interest in the field of criminal justice; one member of the County delegation to the Maryland General Assembly; one member of the legal profession who practices in Montgomery County; and a representative of the Commission on Juvenile Justice. The County Executive appoints the chair.

Terms -- Four years

Comments -- The long-standing Executive Director of the CJCC retired in July 2003. The budget for FY 2004 did not fund a new Executive Director or continue the funding for a dedicated staff liaison, but rather proposed that the Chief Administrative Office would staff the CJCC from other staff in the CAO's office. As a result, there was a need to review the current law establishing the duties and responsibilities of the CJCC and how the CJCC would operate in the future. Legislation was introduced in March 2004 (Bill 4-04) and enacted by the Council in June 2004 which revises the law concerning the CJCC. Changes to the commission under this law include increasing the number of members to 30 (23 ex-officio and 7 public-at-large), reducing the number of mandated meetings to four times per year, and modifying the duties of the commission. Under the new law, which will take effect September 24, 2004, an annual report is not mandated. Over the last year, the commission has continued to meet and fulfill its important mission. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Continue per the recently passed legislation.

## **EAST COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Created: Resolution 12-1032

Purpose : To advise the County Executive and the County Council of East County citizens' issues and concerns; advocate for regional priorities; and help facilitate solutions. The Board also holds public forums as needed on topics of interest to the community and voices its recommendations to the County Executive vis-à-vis the County's budgetary priorities.

Membership: Eighteen members, including one position reserved for a business representative. The membership represents a cross-section of citizens living or working in the Eastern region, including communities in the Fairland, White Oak and Cloverly neighborhoods. The area is roughly bound on the west by the Northwest Branch, on the north by Ednor Road, on the east by the Howard County and Prince George's County lines, and on the south by I-495.

Comments -- Similar to the other County Regional Citizens Advisory Boards, the East County Citizens Advisory Board (ECCAB) serves the important function of providing a forum for citizens to learn about and express their opinions on local issues. The ECCAB has been actively involved in many issues: site selection for a new high school, the proposed Inter-County Connector; police presence in the area; new science and technology park; the new FDA campus in White Oak and the Master Planning process for the area. The ECAB meetings also provide an efficient and convenient venue for County officials and staff, local residents, local business concerns, experts, developers and other interest groups to exchange information and ideas. The Board does not publish an annual report.

Recommendation --Continue. This Board should continue to seek to work collaboratively with other regional B/C/C to develop partnerships and collaborative solutions to mutual issues and concerns. Expand recruitment and target outreach to community groups for more diverse representation on the Board and for overall community representation at meetings. Take over recreation advisory function with the abolishment of the East County Area Recreation Advisory Board. Continue to promote opportunities for joint B/C/C meetings to share county-wide issues, board best practices, board challenges, and lessons learned. Share orientation process and best practices. An annual report should be published.

## **ENERGY AND AIR QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 18A-5

Purpose -- To assist the County Council and the County Executive in carrying out the purposes of Chapter 18A, Energy Policy, and Chapter 3, Air Quality Control. The Committee has the following duties: a) Advise the County Executive and the County Council of the activities of the Committee in furthering the goals of Chapters 3 and 18A; (b) Develop recommendations to promote and implement immediate and long-range energy consciousness in all segments of the community; (c) Comment on or assist in developing programs to meet air quality standards and to promote healthy indoor and outdoor air quality; (d) Identify areas and methods to encourage voluntary participation in energy conservation efforts and air quality improvements; (e) Educate the public and private sectors about the efficient use of energy and its direct benefits for improved air quality; (f) Carry out such other duties as may be assigned from time to time by the County Executive and the County Council to assist in fulfilling the purposes of Chapter 18A.

Membership -- Fifteen members. The Chair is designated by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. Members must be citizens of the County who are technically knowledgeable and interested in energy and air quality. In addition to the 15 voting members of the Committee, the County Executive and the County Council may each appoint an ex-officio, non-voting member to serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

Comments -- The County Code provides a very specific and clear mandate for this Committee. EAQAC makes excellent use of its Departmental website to communicate to members and the public. The committee appears to be well run and effective. Specific goals and action plans for each subcommittee provide clear direction. While there is a cause and effect relationship between energy use and air quality, it is often difficult to treat these disciplines and their issues as one. In addition, the interests and technical expertise of members are generally in one arena or the other. As a result, much of the committee work takes place in the subcommittees. The detailed duties provided in the County Code should serve as a best practice example for the legislation of new B/C/C. The Committee's use of web technology is another best practice that may be emulated by others. An annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue.



## **COMMITTEE FOR ETHNIC AFFAIRS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Sec. 27-53

Purpose -- The Committee is to advise the County Executive and the County Council on public policy that relates to ethnic affairs; participate in community events in celebration of ethnic diversity; and, promote maximum involvement of all ethnic groups in the County in government, business and community affairs.

Membership -- 26 members - approximately one-half of the members are selected from ethnic groups and one-half from the business and education communities in the County.

Comments-- From 1992 – 2002 the Department of Recreation took over the lead responsibility for organizing the ethnic heritage festival, which had previously been the responsibility of the Committee for Ethnic Affairs. Subsequently, this festival was cancelled by the County due to budgetary concerns. Since 1992, the Committee has struggled to develop a clearly defined mission with defined goals and functions that relate to the County’s growing and diverse population. The Committee has promoted ethnic creativity in the arts and has worked on a video, “Know your Neighbor.”

There is a great need to address important issues in the County affecting the burgeoning new immigrant populations and to encourage communication among ethnic groups and between ethnic groups and the County’s social service providers. The CEA publishes an annual report. This group has a difficult time recruiting and keeping its full membership.

Recommendation -- Continue. With the assistance of the Office of Community Outreach, the CEA should develop a mission statement that clearly states its purpose and duties to include creating a forum for all ethnic groups in the County, to integrate the diverse communities within the County’s population, and to identify existing and potential problems and possible solutions. A merger with the Committee on Hate and Violence should be studied, since there are many important issues that the two groups could more efficiently address together.

## **COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Chapter 2, Section 2-146

Purpose -- The County Executive must appoint and convene at least every ten years, subject to confirmation by the Council, a citizens review committee, which must review the committee system and each then-existing committee and report to the Executive and Council its recommendations for changes in individual committees and the committee system as a whole.

Membership -- 9 members.

Terms -- Members serve approximately two years.

Comments -- There is a very large amount of work involved in CERB's charge. Dealing with five resignations of Board members in the course of the two years presented challenges to the group. An Interim Report has been prepared; this report constitutes the Final Report.

Recommendation -- Continue. Based on the experience of this Board over the past 2 years, the following recommendations should help future CERB's complete their mission.

- Increase the number of members to 11. Unlike all other B/C/C, the CERB has no natural constituency. There is not a pool of advocates or interest groups (such as farmers or gun owners) to provide CERB membership. When a member resigns (the 2002-2004 CERB has had 5 members leave), replacing a member takes months. During this time, the group effort suffers and/or adds additional Board assignments for the remaining members. Adding 2 more members should allow the CERB to account for members leaving during the term and enable redistribution of the large workload.
- Appoint the Chair and Vice Chair or Co-Chairs before the CERB starts. Too much time was spent getting the group to self organize and appoint leadership. The time would have been better spent doing research and meeting with B/C/C and County departments. The objectivity of the CERB should not be compromised if the Council and Executive each appointed a person with B/C/C experience for a co-leadership position.

## **FACILITIES IMPLEMENTATION GROUP**

Created -- County Council Resolution No. 13-1498

Purpose -- To address community and environmental issues and concerns pertaining to the operations of the County's solid waste facilities located in the Dickerson area. These facilities include the Resource Recovery Facility, the Yard Trim Composting Facility, properties originally purchased for the Site 2 landfill, and property associated with the original Matthews Farm.

Membership -- 18 members. 12 voting members including representatives of Sugarloaf Citizens Association, For a Rural Montgomery (FARM), the Town of Poolesville, the Town of Barnesville, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), the Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, and 6 representatives of the affected community. Six non-voting members including representatives of the Operator of the Resource Recovery Facility, the Operator of the Dickerson Compost Facility, the Operator of the Dickerson PEPCO Facility, and the County's Departments of Public Works and Transportation, Environmental Protection, and M-NCPPC.

Comments -- This group is committed to protecting and preserving the quality of rural life in the agricultural reserve of upper Montgomery County. Members take very seriously their oversight role in the implementation of the Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan, and minimizing impacts on the affected community. Members have indicated that they occasionally do not receive information from the County about proposals and projects in a timely manner, or are not included in planning activities that may affect their community. The current schedule of quarterly meetings may make updates even less timely. Recruiting applicants to fill the required membership categories is difficult and current recruitment methods are not always effective. The FIG is concerned with attracting members who have specific expertise in the technical disciplines covered by the environmental effects of solid waste facility operations and who also share the community's interest in preserving their rural legacy. While their advisory goals overlap with those of the SWAC and the Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, both the membership and the DPWT recognize the value of a community focused advisory group in this region of the county. FIG is cognizant of the fact that their recommendations must be realistic and consider the broader needs of the County.

Although the FIG was created specifically to address citizen concerns related to solid waste management facilities in the Dickerson area, the group has potential for evolving a broader mandate related to the environment and quality of life in this rural area. Assuming that the need for focused oversight of the Dickerson facility will diminish over time, the FIG members might consider long-term strategies to maintain an active voice in County government. For example, consider strengthening the presence of these citizens in other related B/C/C (e.g., Solid Waste Advisory Committee, Water Quality Advisory Group, Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee, Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board, and the Agricultural B/C/C). In addition, with a revised charter, the FIG could be maintained as a community based citizens advisory group that is staffed by the Upcounty Regional Services Center. The FIG publishes an annual report.

Recommendation – Continue. Future planning should consider alternate long-term strategies for ensuring that the residents of this geographic area are adequately represented in County B/C/C.

## **FRIENDSHIP HEIGHTS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Council Resolution No. 14-325

Purpose -- The FHTMDAC may advise the Transportation Management Organization (TMO), any employer and any other party with whom the County contacts pursuant to Resolution 14-325 and Section 42A-23(b) and the County government on all aspects of programs, management, and finances relating to the implementation of the transportation system and demand management in the Friendship Heights TMD and vicinity. Specifically, the FHTMDAC may (a) propose guidelines for traffic mitigation plans; (b) monitor the implementation of the traffic mitigation plans; (c) evaluate progress in

attaining the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy (AGP), if any; (d) recommend government, private or joint actions necessary to facilitate attainment of the commuting goals specified in the AGP, if any; (e) advise the Director of DPWT on parking policies; (f) review traffic patterns and control measures in the Friendship Heights TMD and vicinity, including any relevant issues relating to neighborhood parking and to pedestrian access and safety.

Membership -- 14 Voting and 8 Nonvoting representatives.

**Voting Representatives:**

4 members nominated by the Greater Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce, with two representing employers of fewer than 50 employees in the Friendship Heights TMD and two representing employers of 50 or more employees in the Friendship Heights TMD, and including one representative with retail employees; 2 members nominated by the Friendship Heights Village Council; 1 member nominated by the Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers; 1 member nominated by the Somerset Town Council; 1 member nominated by the Somerset House Management Association; 1 member nominated by the Citizens Coordinating Committee on Friendship Heights; 4 members nominated from among the development projects mandated to participate in the TMD. These can be tenants and/or employers designated by the owners of these projects. **Nonvoting representatives:** The Directors, or their designees, of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase RSC and DPWT; a designee of the Planning Board; a representative of the County Police Department, and a representative of the Chevy Chase Village Police Department; three representatives of the District of Columbia as follows: (a) one nominated by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission of the adjacent neighborhood; (b) one nominated by the business community of the adjacent neighborhood; and (c) one nominated by the District of Columbia Government.

Comments -- This committee consists of knowledgeable and enthusiastic members and staff, and is successful in its operations. The voting members are mandated to come from certain organizations in the Friendship Heights area (there are no general public positions). Those organizations are not always able to provide candidates for the voting positions, and recruitment is difficult. When a member leaves for any reason, that position must be filled by a person nominated by the same organization and this can take a long time. The committee does not prepare an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB recommends that the Chamber of Commerce not be involved in the nomination of employer representatives. The business representatives should be able to apply directly to the County Executive. This Committee would work better if flexibility in the filling of employer representative positions were permitted. The employer size requirements for certain members should be a goal rather than a mandate. An annual report should be prepared.

## COMMITTEE ON HATE/VIOLENCE

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Chapter 27-63 as amended

Purpose -- The Committee advises the County Council, the County Executive and County agencies about hate/violence in the County and recommends such policies, programs, legislation or regulations as it finds necessary to reduce the incidence of acts of hate/violence. An annual report is submitted each year by October 1 to the Executive and Council on the activities of the Committee, including the source and amount of any contribution received from a public or private source to support the activities of the Committee. Members also develop and distribute information about hate/violence in the County; promote educational activities that demonstrate the positive value of ethnic and social diversity in the County; and adopt necessary rules and procedures.

Membership -- Fifteen voting members who are County residents and six nonvoting members. Of the 15 voting members, at least 9 should be identified with ethnic or other groups in the County which are frequently the subject of acts of hate/ violence; at least 2 should be parents of school-age children; and at least one should be identified with the County business community.

Comments -- The Committee on Hate/Violence (CHV) was initially created and staffed by the County Council in response to the County's changing demographics. Subsequently, the Council made the decision to house this group in the Office of Human Rights. The CHV initially concerned itself with festivals and making new County residents feel welcome. More recent activities include sponsoring an essay contest in middle schools (this is no longer being done), and there is a new focus on education. This Committee is allowed to solicit funds and does have a small budget. Current members wish to pursue fund solicitation which has not been done in the past. The CHV and the Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence receive some of the same Police briefings and could meet together to save staff time. There were comments received regarding the unclear mission of the Committee and its lack of focus. There has also been a substantial amount of turnover on the Committee and a lack of leadership. Staffing is provided by an Office Services Coordinator. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Merge. The Committee on Hate/Violence should include as part of its mission the work of the Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence. This will reduce staffing requirements and time for both the Police Department and the Office of Human Rights. Additionally, a clearer mission statement is needed and the relationship between the Committee on Hate/Violence and the work of the Committee for Ethnic Affairs needs to be determined. There may be opportunities for further merging or collaboration among these groups. Provide additional professional level staffing. An annual report should be published.

## **COMMISSION ON HEALTH**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 24-23.

Purpose -- Advise the County Executive and the County Council on public health programs, services and facilities and comment on any gaps, deficiencies or duplication of efforts. The Commission will report each year on the performance of Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services programs, needed improvements, funding and priorities. The Commission will also advise on local public health planning needs, metropolitan area wide institutional health services and State of Maryland health-related issues where appropriate.

Membership -- 19 voting members representing a cross section of consumers and providers of health care, who are drawn from such populations as the disabled, the elderly, minority groups, the general population, physicians, other health professionals, health care institutions, health care insurers, health maintenance organizations, health professional schools and the allied health professionals, and one member must be a member of the Montgomery County Medical Society. The majority of the members must not be providers of health services. Each member must reside or have a primary place of business in Montgomery County. Two non-voting ex-officio members are (1) a member of the County Council or the Council's designated representative, and (2) the county health officer.

Comments -- This dedicated group of consumers and providers performs a worthwhile service at a time when there is increased emphasis on public health issues. Current issues include health disparities among minorities, lead in water, access to care, and bioterrorism. The Commission has had some difficulty reaching consensus and this has occasionally led to a failure to achieve results. This Commission publishes an annual report.

Recommendations -- Continue. The group needs to define achievable goals.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-2.

Purpose -- The Commission's duties mandate that it work to eliminate discrimination, prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry in housing, recreation, education, health, employment, public accommodations, and justice, regardless of race, color, religious creed, ancestry, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, sexual orientation, genetic status, presence of children, or source of income, and promote goodwill, cooperation, understanding and positive human relations among all residents. Initiate or receive and investigate complaints of discrimination against any person; study and investigate by means of

public hearings, or otherwise any conditions having an adverse effect on inter-group relations; institute and conduct educational and other programs to promote equal rights for all persons; render not less than once a year a written report of activities and recommendations to the County Executive; recommend such legislation as deemed necessary to promote and insure equal rights and opportunities for all persons; and adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out purposes and provisions of said ordinance. The Commission must appoint a case review board of 3 individuals to consider and decide each complaint that the Director of the Human Rights Commission certifies to the Commission.

Membership -- 15 Commissioners who may also serve on Case Review Boards.

Financial Disclosure -- Confidential disclosure required for members of the Commission and its Panels (the still-existing precursor to the Case Review Boards).

Comments -- This is a strongly committed and active Commission. In addition to case reviews, the commission is actively involved in community outreach and education. Members indicated that they could be more effective if there were a source of funding available to them. They are not interested in fund-raising directly because of the potential for conflict-of-interest. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Continue. Build an effective partnership between the Commission, which is very successful at outreach, and the Committee on Hate/Violence (or its successor) which does have the authority to fundraise. An annual report should be published.

## **INTERAGENCY COORDINATING BOARD FOR COMMUNITY USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES**

Authority -- Sec. 44-3, Montgomery County Code as amended

Purpose -- To promote community use of public school facilities; encourage interagency cooperation regarding the community use of public school facilities; adopt regulations necessary for community use of those facilities; recommend fee schedules to the County Executive and County Council; review major contracts and grants to be negotiated between the County and MCPS; review budget prepared by the Executive Director and make budget recommendations thereon to the Chief Administrative Officer, County Executive and County Council.

Membership -- Nine voting members, as prescribed by law, who serve without compensation consisting of : (1) Chief Administrative Officer, (2) Superintendent of Schools, (3) President of Montgomery College, (4) member of the Montgomery County Planning Board, designated by

Montgomery County members of M-NCPPC, (5) a representative of the County Council, (6) one citizen appointed by the Superintendent of Schools and confirmed by the Board of Education, and (7) three citizens appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council. Three non-voting ex-officio members: one member of the Board of Education selected by the BOE; one representative of the Montgomery County Association of Secondary School Principals (confirmed by the County Council), and one representative of the Elementary School Administrators Association (confirmed by the County Council).

Terms-- Public members serve four year terms.

Meetings -- Quarterly (2 hours) and as needed

Comments -- This is a well-run board which creates, implements, and evaluates policies for the community's use of public school facilities without interfering with the K-12 instructional program and provides guidance to the Director, Office of Community Use of Public Facilities on issues of importance to Montgomery County. Strong staff leadership and efficient meetings maximize time and resources effectively. The Board does not publish an annual report.

Recommendations -- Continue. Share best practices on meeting management with other boards and commissions. An annual report should be published.

## **COMMISSION ON JUVENILE JUSTICE**

Created -- Section 12-36 of the Montgomery County Code.

Purpose -- The Montgomery County Commission on Juvenile Justice is an independent advisory body whose purpose is to advise the County Executive, County Council and the Juvenile Court Division of the Circuit Court on matters concerning juveniles. This is accomplished by gathering and disseminating information from public and private agencies serving youth, monitoring the functioning of the Juvenile Justice system, visiting facilities, and closely following State and County legislative proposals affecting juveniles.

Membership -- 39 members. 23 members represent the public at large and 10 liaison representatives represent the County Council, the County Executive, the State's Attorney, the Family Division of the Circuit Court, Police Department, the state Department of Juvenile Justice, the Court Appointed Special Advocate, the Board of Education; two representatives from the County Department of Health and Human Services (one representing child welfare services and one representing community-based services for at-risk youth), in each case appointed by



the Executive, subject to Council confirmation, after receiving a recommendation from the person or office to be represented. There are 3 voting ex-officio members who are the County's Juvenile Court Division Judges. Nonvoting members emeritus are past members who have given outstanding service and possess special expertise in juvenile matters. Members emeritus may be appointed by the Executive, subject to confirmation by the Council. Currently there are 3 non-voting members emeritus.

Comments -- The Commission has been instrumental in moving several major initiatives to successful outcomes, including the transfer of the Juvenile Court to the Circuit Court, the creation and implementation of a Juvenile Justice Information System, and assuming a lead role in reporting on disproportionate minority representation in the juvenile justice system. The Commission believes that due to its size and mission, more could be accomplished with full-time staff assistance. An annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue. DHHS should review the staffing level of this Commission.

## **LIBRARY BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 2-46

Purpose -- Inquire into matters affecting the County public library system including the acquisition and location of new library facilities, the adequacy of book collections, services to outlying districts and personnel needs of the Department of Libraries and to make recommendations thereon to the County Executive.

Membership -- 12 members and the supervisor of school libraries serves as an Ex-Officio School Board Representative.

Comments -- This board does an excellent job meeting its mandate. It is well managed and has a clear plan for the future. The Board does not produce an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. An annual report should be prepared.

## **MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

<u>Created</u> --	Montgomery County Code Chapter 24-34 and State law, Chapter 21.
<u>Purpose</u> --	The Committee monitors, reviews, and evaluates the allocation and adequacy of publicly-funded mental health services within the County through means such as conducting or participating in site visits; determines the needs of the County mental health system, including quality of services, gaps in the system, and interagency coordination; and, participates in the development of the local mental health plan and local mental health budgets. The Committee also prepares an annual report to state and county officials; reviews and comments on the annual mental health plan and preliminary budget for the state mental health grant to the County; and reviews and comments on the annual budget for mental health services of the Department of Health and Human Services.
<u>Membership</u> --	19 voting members (as described in the listing below) and at least 3 nonvoting ex officio members. Members serve without compensation.
<u>Voting Members</u> --	(a) 7 individuals selected as representatives from the following 13 categories: the County Executive, the County Council, the County public schools, the practicing physicians in the County; mental health professionals in the County who are not physicians; the clergy in the County; the legal profession in the County; a local law enforcement agency; a local general hospital that contains an inpatient psychiatric unit; the county office on aging; the Department of Juvenile Services; the Department of Health and Human Services; and a local community rehabilitation or housing program; (b) 4 individuals who are currently receiving or have in the past received mental health services; (c) 3 parents or other relatives of adults with mental disorders; (d) 3 parents or other relatives of children or adolescents with emotional, behavioral, or mental disorders, the onset of which occurred during childhood or adolescence; (e) one representative from the local mental health association; and (f) one member of the general public.
<u>Nonvoting Members</u> --	<u>Ex-Officio, Nonvoting Members are the following individuals or their designees:</u> a) the State Mental Hygiene Administration regional mental health director who serves the County; b) a representative of a State inpatient facility that serves the County; c) Director of the County DHHS; and d) if there are designated State inpatient beds located in County general hospitals, a representative from those facilities.
<u>Comments</u> --	At times this group has had difficulty recruiting for certain types of members, such as consumer, clergy, and parent or other relative of children or adolescent with emotional, behavioral or mental disorders. There are overlaps in some of the issues addressed by the Mental Health Advisory Committee and the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council.

The current Director, Department of Health and Human Services has realigned services in the Department; there is now a Behavioral Health and Crisis Services Division. The Committee does publish an annual report.

Recommendation -- It is recommended that the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council and the Mental Health Advisory Committee be combined into a Behavioral Health or Addictions and Mental Health Advisory Committee. This will be in line with the current organization of the DHHS. It may be necessary to change State law to accommodate this change.

## **MID-COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Authority -- Council Resolution No. 9-40

Purpose -- To provide advice to the Director of the Mid-County Center on area priorities and on ways to tailor services in the center to residents of the region, to identify and understand community issues and advise the County Executive and County Council on the appropriate role for government to assume in resolving these issues.

Membership - Fifteen members who are residents or business owners in the area.

Comments -- A well-run and very active board which seeks to establish an effective voice for the residents and businesses it represents. Provides constituents with monthly electronic newsletter, “Mid-County Sparkler” which is available to residents, homeowner associations, local businesses, and civic associations as an outreach strategy. Continued outreach to the local community is important to ensure a strong overall diverse community representation at meetings and build a more economically, racially, and ethnically diverse applicant pool. Outstanding staff support under tight financial constraints. Strong orientation process which includes an annual bus tour of region to identify key issues and an issue prioritization process which identifies important issues from the citizens the MCAB represents. The Board does not publish an annual report.

Recommendations -- Continue. This Board should continue to seek to work collaboratively with other regional B/C/C to develop partnerships and collaborative solutions to mutual issues and concerns. Expand recruitment and target outreach to community groups for more diverse representation on the Board and for overall community representation at meetings. Take over recreation advisory function with the abolishment of the Mid-County Area Recreation Advisory Board. Continue to promote opportunities for joint B/C/C meetings to share county-wide issues, board best practices, board challenges, and lessons learned. Share orientation process best practices. An annual report should be published.

## **NOISE CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 31B-4.

Purpose -- To advise the County Executive, Director of the Department of Environmental Protection, County Council, and Planning Board on noise control issues, including administration and enforcement of the Montgomery County Code Chapter 31B - Noise Control.

At least every third year, the Board must evaluate the effectiveness of the County's noise control program and recommend any improvements to the Director of the Department of Environmental Protection, County Executive, County Council, and Planning Board.

No later than March 1 each year, the Chair of the Board must report to the Director of the Department of Environmental Protection, County Executive, County Council, and Planning Board on activities and actions the Noise Control Advisory Board took during the previous calendar year.

Membership -- Eleven members.

Meetings -- Meetings must be held at least once each quarter. Currently meeting every other month.

Comments -- This board has a specific, well-defined mission that is not addressed by any other B/C/C. It contributes to the County by advising DEP regarding the technical aspects and community impact of proposed projects, by bringing attention to community concerns that have not been identified by DEP, and by contributing in-depth technical expertise. The board has been involved in critical projects such as establishing criteria for highway sound barriers, development of fact sheets for public education, and designation of special protection areas. All administrative and clerical support for this board is provided by a Program Manager. The Committee does produce an annual report each November.

Recommendation -- Continue. Consider providing additional part-time staff to take care of tasks such as recording and distributing minutes and other committee materials, scheduling, etc. Add information regarding the activities of this board to the DEP website, similar to what has been done for the Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee and the Water Quality Advisory Group.

## **PARTNERSHIP BOARD FOR VICTIMS OF HATE/VIOLENCE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Sec. 27-26F

Purpose -- Responsible for publicizing the Partnership Fund for victims of hate/violence and soliciting private contributions to the Fund. From the Fund, the Board may compensate a victim of hate/violence an amount not to exceed \$1,000 for each incident and no more than \$5,000 to any one victim in any 12 month period. The award is reduced by the amount of any payment received by the victim from any private or public source as compensation for damages.

Membership -- Seven members

Meetings -- Monthly or as needed to review cases.

Comments -- This board receives police briefings on hate/violence incidents in the County and makes decisions regarding compensating victims. The usual award is \$200-\$300 and approximately 10 cases referred by the Police Department are deliberated each year. There has been some problem recruiting for this Board. An annual report is not published.

Recommendation -- Merge. There is some duplication of police briefings and staff work that is being done for this Board and the Committee on Hate/Violence. This work could be done by a subcommittee of the Committee on Hate/Violence or a subcommittee of the Human Rights Commission.

## **COMMISSION ON PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES**

Authority-- Sec. 27-51, Montgomery County Code

Purpose-- To advise the County government on the coordination and development of policies for people with disabilities. Included in its duties are:

- reviewing programs and services;
- identifying, analyzing, and evaluating barriers;
- reviewing federal, state, and local legislation;
- conducting open meetings;
- identifying state and federal funding sources
- making recommendations for procedures, programs, and legislation;
- advising the Department of Health and Human Services on federal laws and necessary programs and services.

Membership-- 25 voting members and at least 6 non-voting members. Thirteen of the voting members are to be people with disabilities; three members are to be parents of people with disabilities, and nine members are to be representatives from organizations and agencies that provide services

or represent people with disabilities. The non-voting members are from County departments such as Health and Human Services, Recreation, Transportation, and the Human Rights Commission.

Comments -- This is a well-run commission which proactively seeks strategies to address issues and concerns of people with disabilities. The CPWD advises on the County's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other disability laws. It also provides outreach to county citizens with regard to disability issues. Accommodations are made for people with disabilities to attend and participate in meetings and there is extensive community outreach for commission vacancies, meetings, and programs. An annual report is published.

Recommendation: Continue. The CPWD should continue to share its best practice information and resources with other B/C/C within Montgomery County. This is especially true for the Commission's comprehensive orientation manual and the Commission's self-assessment and operational planning process. The CPWD should work with the Offices of the County Executive and other B/C/C to see that people with disabilities are provided opportunities to serve and encourage people with disabilities to apply.

## **RANGE APPROVAL COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 57-2, amended 1991

Purpose -- To issue approval certificates for target, trap and skeet ranges, and shooting areas which specify the type of gun or ammunition which may be used on such range or area. The committee also makes recommendations to the County Executive and the County Council concerning the extension of the maximum expansion area boundaries as well as the boundaries of the urban area where firearms can or can not be discharged.

Membership -- Seven members. Chairman designated by County Executive.

Comments -- The Committee has 2 missions. The first is range safety. The Committee inspects each of the six ranges in the County every 3 years for safety and is the only group concerned with the safety issue. The second mission is to work with the Police Department reviewing the boundaries of the defined urban area. There is no annual report published.

Recommendation -- Continue. The Police Department should permanently assign the Police Range Officer as the staff for this committee since that officer runs the range. This Committee should be given a new name such as Firearm Safety Committee to better reflect its mission. The only ranges that this Committee cannot inspect for safety are the ranges operated by the Police Department. The County Executive should take action to see that Police Department ranges are inspected every 3 years by the Committee for the safety of the Officers using the range and the public. The Committee needs to create a standard safety

checklist so that each range is evaluated using the same criteria. The Committee needs to publish an annual report on the ranges it has inspected and approved and on recommendations dealing with the urban boundaries.

## **COUNTY-WIDE RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Montgomery County Code – Section 41-21 through 41-30.

Purpose -- Advisory to the County Executive, the County Council, the Director of the Department of Recreation, and the Planning Board. The Boards shall encourage the development of desirable recreational and park opportunities in the designated recreation areas of the County.

Membership-- **County-Wide:** 20 members consisting of 15 at-large members, and 5 representatives for each of the five regional recreation advisory boards.  
7 non-voting ex-officio members: a representative of the Dept. of Parks of the M-NCPPC, an administrative representative of the Board of Education, the immediate past Board Chair, and representatives from the Office of Community Use of Schools, Community Action Board, Commission on Aging, and Commission on People with Disabilities, and  
4 alternate members from the County-at-large. (31 total members)  
**Area/Regional Boards** --There are five area boards: West County, Upcounty, East County, Mid-County and Silver Spring. Each of the five regional boards has 9 members and 2 alternates who reside in the designated recreation area.

Comments -- There has been difficulty filling all the positions on the County-wide and Regional Recreation Boards and more diverse representation is needed. CERB believes that the five Regional Citizens Advisory Boards are well-equipped to deal with recreation and park issues and have a more diverse membership as well. The overlap of information to the Regional Recreation Boards with the County-wide Recreation Board provides a duplication of effort that is not providing additional benefit and is staff intensive. It is also confusing to citizens who do not know where to bring up specific issues. County-wide recreation issues can continue to be handled at the County-Wide Recreation Advisory Board; regional needs should be addressed and coordinated by the Regional Service Centers' Citizens Advisory Boards. No annual report is published.

Recommendation --Continue the County-wide Recreation Advisory Board, insuring that there is county-wide membership reflective of the five regions; discontinue the alternate positions. The CERB is recommending that each of the regional recreation boards be discontinued and their work be subsumed by the Regional Services Centers' Citizens Advisory Boards. There should be formal liaison positions between the Regional Service Centers' Citizens Advisory Boards and the County-wide Recreation Advisory Board. An annual report should be published.

**AREA/REGIONAL RECREATION ADVISORY BOARDS -- WESTERN AREA, EAST COUNTY, UPCOUNTY, MID-COUNTY AND SILVER SPRING RECREATION ADVISORY BOARDS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code – Section 41-21 thru 30. Exec. Order 239-01.

Purpose -- Advisory to the County Executive, the County Council, the Director of the Department of Recreation, and the Planning Board. The Boards shall encourage the development of desirable recreational and park opportunities in the designated recreation areas of the County.

Membership -- **Area/Regional Boards** --There are five area boards: West County, Upcounty, East County, Mid-County and Silver Spring. Each of the five regional boards has 9 members and 2 alternates who reside in the designated recreation area.

Comments -- Formerly the Recreation Department had three defined recreation areas (Upcounty or previously called the Northern Area, Western Montgomery County and the East County). In March 2002, the regional recreation boards were expanded from three areas to five areas. Since that time, recruitment on the area boards has been challenging, especially in terms of diversity, and some positions have been left unfilled.

This difficulty was also referenced in the 1992 Committee on Committee's Report ("Maintaining a steady level of participation has been difficult due to number of volunteer members required.") The East County Recreation Advisory Board and the Mid-County Recreation Advisory Board are the only area boards that produce an annual report.

Recommendation -- Discontinue. The 5 area boards should be dissolved and area recreation issues should become the responsibility of the five Regional Service Centers' Citizens Advisory Boards. Formal linkages between the Regional Citizens Advisory Boards and the County-wide Recreation Advisory Board should be established. An annual report should be published.

**RUSTIC ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Sec. 49-80

Purpose -- To promote public awareness and knowledge of the rustic roads program in the County; review and comment on classification of rustic roads and exceptional rustic roads; review and comment on Executive Regulations and other County policies and programs that may affect the program; and report annually on June 1 to the County Executive, the County Council and the Planning Board on the status of the rustic roads program.



Membership -- The Committee has seven voting members. Each member must be a resident of the County. The County Executive should appoint three members who are owner-operators of commercial farmland earning 50 percent or more of their income from farming, one of whom is a representative of the Agricultural Advisory Committee; one member who has knowledge of rural preservation techniques through practical experience and training; one member who has knowledge of roadway engineering through practical experience and training; one member who represents civic associations located in the Agricultural Reserve; and one member who represents civic associations in areas located outside the Agricultural Reserve where there are rustic roads. The Chairman of the Planning Board must designate a member of the Planning Staff as a non-voting member.

Comments -- At times there has been difficulty with recruitment, especially for the civic association representative. Due to the decline in the number of farms and farmers, there are a limited number of farmers to serve on the various agriculture-related B/C/C. Currently two of the three farmer representatives on the Committee have previously served on the Agricultural Advisory Committee. This Committee provides a valuable service in the master plan process on decisions regarding bridges, roadside structures, preservation and conservation issues, and the status of rustic roads, exceptional rustic roads, permit applications, and right-of-ways. A bi-annual report is produced.

Recommendation -- Merge this Committee with other agricultural groups (Agricultural Advisory Committee and the Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board). An annual report should be published.

## **SILVER SPRING CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Resolution No. 8-449

Purpose -- To strengthen communication between the community and the various agencies of the County Government, coordinate necessary interagency action with regard to Silver Spring, and recommend programs and policies tailored to the Silver Spring area.

Membership -- 18 members

Comments -- This Board has been led by a strong and dedicated chairman. It has several very effective subcommittees. Similar to the other County Regional Citizens Advisory Boards, the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board (SSCAB) serves the important function of providing a forum for citizens to learn about and express their opinions on local issues. The SSCAB meetings also provide an efficient and convenient venue for County officials and staff, local residents, local business concerns, developers and other interest groups to exchange information and ideas. The Board does not produce an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. This Board should continue to work collaboratively with other regional B/C/C to develop partnerships and collaborative solutions to mutual issues and concerns. Expanded recruitment and targeted outreach to community groups should result in more diverse representation on the Board and for overall community representation at meetings. Take over recreation advisory function with the abolishment of the Silver Spring Recreation Advisory Board. Continue to promote opportunities for joint B/C/C meetings to share county-wide issues, board best practices, board challenges, and lessons learned. The SSCAB should produce an annual report.

## **SILVER SPRING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Section 42A-10.

Purpose -- The Committee may advise the County government on all aspects of programs, management and finances relating to the implementation of transportation system management in the Silver Spring Central Business District and vicinity. The Committee also proposes guidelines for traffic mitigation plans; monitors the implementation of the traffic mitigation plans; evaluates progress in attaining the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy for Silver Spring; recommends government, private or joint actions necessary to facilitate attainment of the commuting goals specified in the Annual Growth Policy; advises the Director of DOT on parking policies, including any relevant issues relating to neighborhood parking and pedestrian access and safety; and, submits comments and recommendations on the Director's Annual Report by December 1 of each year.

Membership -- 12 voting members and 4 non-voting members. Three members are nominated by the Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce; three members are nominated by the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board of which one is a resident of the transportation management district established in the Silver Spring Central Business District; one is a resident within the North and Western Silver Spring Sector Plan areas; and one is a resident of the southern portion of the Kemp Mill-Four Corners or the Silver Spring East master plan area, or the Montgomery County portion of the Takoma Park planning area. Three members are employers of fewer than 50 employees and three members are employers of 50 or more employees in the Central Business District. Non-voting members are the Directors or the designees of the Department of Transportation and the Silver Spring Center; a representative of the Planning Board; and, a representative of the Montgomery County Police Department.

Comments -- Some Committee categories have been extremely difficult to fill and require a difficult process (such as nomination of residents by the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board from four regional planning areas and a requirement to send letters to civic

association presidents and the City of Takoma Park). An estimated 25% of those who do become Committee members do not complete their terms. The Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board already has a subcommittee that deals with transportation issues. The Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee also takes an interest in transportation issues in downtown. The Committee does not prepare an annual report.

Recommendation -- Discontinue. CERB recommends this Committee be eliminated as it duplicates efforts by two other Silver Spring advisory groups (Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board and Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee) and it has continual problems with filling and keeping members which prevent the Committee from effectively meeting its goals. The work should be done by one of these other groups.

### **SILVER SPRING URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Sec. 68A-5 (a).

Purpose -- The Committee should, by July 15 of each year, advise the Department of Transportation and Public Works on the program and budget of the urban district; by September 15 of each year, review the urban district budget and submit comments to the Department; and by October 1 of each year, meet with the Department Director to resolve areas of disagreement regarding the budget.

Membership -- Eight members which includes two persons nominated by the Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce; three representatives of optional method developers; one representative from a business that employs fewer than 10 employees; one representative of a residential community in the urban district; and one representative of a residential community either in or outside of the urban district and who is nominated by the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board.

Comments -- This Board is requesting that its voting members be increased from eight to eleven (adding two additional small business members and one additional residential member) due to the expansion of businesses and residential housing in downtown Silver Spring. The Board has historically had trouble with recruitment due to the strict category requirements and the inability to find members in specific categories. The Committee does not produce an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. CERB recommends that this Board be increased to eleven members. It is also recommends that specific membership categories be made goals (soft targets) and not mandates. The resident representative (either inside or outside the urban district) who is nominated by the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board should instead be a member of the Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board, to be consistent with the other urban district advisory committees. An annual report should be published.

## **BOARD OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

Authority -- Maryland Code Article 88-A, Section 14 and Montgomery County Code Sec. 37-8

Purpose -- Advise local Director and state Director of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the local application of state policies or procedures; keeping well informed on local departmental activities, communicating to resident's broad and comprehensive information as to the objectives, policies, programs, and problems of local social services and public assistance administration.

Membership -- Thirteen members; one must be a member of the County Council.

Financial Disclosure--Confidential disclosure required

Comments -- This Board deals with a variety of issues related to social services within Montgomery County and the state of Maryland that several other Montgomery County B/C/C also deal with on a specialized basis. The Board of Social Services interacts with these other boards on an as-needed basis. No annual report is published.

Recommendations -- Continue. Meetings should be more broadly publicized to encourage greater community participation. There should also be communication with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) service recipients, and more involvement from diverse community groups and residents. Opportunities for sharing of information and cross communication with other B/C/C within the DHHS, county, and state who have similar missions and concerns should be coordinated to encourage joint ventures, reduce duplication of efforts, and encourage mutually beneficial partnerships. An annual report should be published.

## **SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section, 48-38

Purpose -- To advise the County Council and the County Executive on all matters relating to solid waste management within the county. (1) Review and offer recommendations on the county's ten-year solid waste management plans. (2) Investigate and make recommendations on systematic programs and alternative methods, both public and private, for the storage, collection, transportation, processing, disposal and resource recovery of solid wastes, including sludge. (3) Evaluate the impact of the solid waste management program on citizens, institutions, business and industry throughout the county. (4) Recommend methods to assure public involvement in solid waste planning and develop educational programs to inform the public on all aspects of solid waste management. (5) Recommend local and state legislation necessary to

accomplish effective solid waste management.(6) Review and comment on the annual county budget for solid waste activities.(7) Submit to the County Executive and County Council, and make available to the general public, an annual report of the activities of the committee.

Membership -- Fifteen voting members. The County Executive appoints members, subject to confirmation by the County Council, to include (a) broad geographical areas of the county, (b) the solid waste industry, (c) business users, (d) a representative of the Montgomery County chapter of the Maryland Municipal League, and (e) the general public. In addition, there is one ex-officio, non-voting representative of MNCPPC.

Comments -- This is a well functioning committee that provides a valuable service to the County. Occasionally its ability to perform effectively has been hampered through lack of timely communication from other branches of government regarding projects and policy proposals. The County Code outlines specific operational functions for this committee beyond what is mandated for other B/C/C. These include special procedures for nominating members, appointing officers, and establishment of subcommittee functions. Section 48-42 references a solid waste collection advisory subcommittee that is nonexistent. The Committee produces an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. There should be a review of the County Code to assess whether changes are warranted regarding specific language about the operations of this Committee.

## **TAXICAB SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 53-37

Purpose -- To study, inquire into and examine taxicab matters affecting the public interest, including a review of the state of the taxicab utility, the adequacy of service to the public, including any special or unusual issues and problems.

Membership -- Eleven Members.

**Voting Members:** Nine members--four represent the taxicab industry: 2 must represent management and 2 must be taxicab drivers; of the 2 drivers, one must be an owner-operator and one must be a non-owner operator; five public members including one representative of people with disabilities.

**Non-Voting, Ex-Officio** Two members --a representative of the Director, Dept. of Public Works and Transportation and of the County Attorney.

Chair -- Appointed by the County Executive, confirmed by the Council.

Financial Disclosure - Confidential disclosure required.

Comments -- This group does a good job balancing the needs of the community with the taxicab industry interests. There has been a problem recruiting for taxicab driver positions. No annual report is published.

Recommendations -- Continue. It is recommended that categories be made goals rather than requirements for the taxicab driver representative (owner-operator or non-owner operator) since it is difficult to find applicants in the driver category. An annual report should be published.

## **UPCOUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Resolution No. 10-1279

Purpose -- Review and comment, within statutory requirements and guidelines, proposed zoning amendments and section map amendments, master plans and related plan amendments, six year capital improvements program (CIP) of County and bi-County agencies, operating budgets of County and bi-County agencies; health and human service matters, land acquisition by County and other government agencies, location and design of fire stations, schools, recreation centers, libraries and other government buildings and facilities, transportation routes, schedules and services within the County, including school busing, and all other matters coming before the County government for decision which relate to, or affect, the Upcounty Center's service area. Advise the Director of the Upcounty Center in identifying demographic, economic and social patterns in the area.

Membership -- 20 members, representing a cross-section of citizens living or working in the Upcounty region, such as in Germantown, Gaithersburg, Laytonsville, Damascus, Poolesville, Clarksburg, Montgomery Village, and North Potomac.

Comments -- The Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board is a well run, effective Board. An annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue. This Board should continue to seek to work collaboratively with other regional B/C/C to develop partnerships and collaborative solutions to mutual issues and concerns. Expand recruitment and target outreach to community groups for more diverse representation on the Board and for overall community representation at meetings. Take over recreation advisory function with the abolishment of the Upcounty Area Recreation Advisory Board. Continue to promote opportunities for joint B/C/C meetings to share county-wide issues, board best practices, board challenges, and lessons learned. Share orientation process best practices.

## **ADVISORY BOARD ON VICTIMS AND THEIR FAMILIES**

(also known as Victims Services Advisory Board)

Created -- Montgomery County Code - Art. VII - Section 24-56.

Purpose -- Periodically review available services and facilities for victims and their families; determine needs of the victim and family services program; submit at least one report annually to the County Executive and County Council on the progress of programs to victims and their families and of actions needed to improve those programs; make recommendations for appropriate allocation of funds in accordance with agreed upon priorities and consideration of financial resources. The Board also assists the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services in the development of the annual victim services and families plan, and acts as a local advocate for victim services programming.

Membership -- 18 voting members who are residents of Montgomery County and 4 non-voting members. The voting members consist of five citizens from among the mental health, legal, medical, dental and nursing professions; ten citizens at-large; one member of the clergy; and representatives designated by the Alcoholism and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council and the Mental Health Advisory Committee.  
Four non-voting ex officio members shall be the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services and representatives from the State's Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office; and the Department of Police.

Comments -- The Advisory Board on Victims and Their Families (also known as Victims Services Advisory Board) has deeply committed members. They see their function as advocating for victims rights, including the matter of sentencing of perpetrators. This Board sent correspondence to CERB requesting that their liaison members from other boards be changed to at-large members. At some point, the working name of this board became known as the Victim Services Advisory Board. The Board recently issued its annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. Since this Board is commonly known and recognized as the "Victim Services Advisory Board," the County Code should be amended to reflect this name change. CERB recommends that the liaisons from the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council and the Mental Health Advisory Committee requirement be dropped and that communication be maintained through the sharing of minutes and ongoing staff liaison dialogue.

## **WATER QUALITY ADVISORY GROUP**

Created -- Montgomery County Code, Section 19-49

Purpose -- Recommend to the Executive and the Council by March 1 each year water quality goals, objectives, policies, programs, and priorities that protect, maintain, and/or restore the biological, chemical and physical integrity of county streams, rivers, wetlands, groundwater, lakes, and other water resources.

Membership -- 18 members composed of up to three non-voting representatives of government agencies and three representatives each of: the public at large; academic and scientific experts; environmental groups; the agricultural community; and the business community.

Comments -- This committee effectively advises the County through written opinions and resolutions. In addition, the Group communicates its activities to the public by publishing meeting minutes on the DEP website. The requirement for specific categories of membership presents a problem for recruitment and diversity, particularly in the scientific/academic category. An annual report is prepared..

Recommendation -- Continue. Provide for flexibility in membership to balance technical and diverse community representation by making the three representatives per category a goal instead of a requirement.

## **WESTERN MONTGOMERY COUNTY CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

Created -- Resolution No. 9-714

Purpose-- To provide advice to the County Executive and the County Council through the Director of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Regional Services Center on area priorities, needs of the Western Montgomery County region for programs and/or services, impact of current services (effectiveness), identification and understanding of the Western Montgomery County communities, and proposed changes in government services for the Western Montgomery County area.

Membership- Fifteen members composed of ten residential representatives and five business representatives from the Western Montgomery County region.

Comments -- A well-run and very active board which seeks to establish an effective voice for the citizens it represents. An off-site annual retreat is held; and there is comprehensive orientation resources and board member mentoring. The Board participates in



recommending Capital Improvements Projects for the region. An annual report is not published.

Recommendations -- Continue. This Board should continue to work collaboratively with other regional B/C/C to develop partnerships and collaborative solutions to mutual issues and concerns. Expand recruitment and target outreach to community groups for more diverse representation on the Board and for overall community representation at meetings. Continue to promote opportunities for joint B/C/C meetings to share county-wide issues, board best practices, board challenges, and lessons learned. Share orientation process best practices. Take over recreation advisory function with the abolishment of Western Area Recreation Advisory Board. An annual report should be published.

### **WHEATON URBAN DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Created – Montgomery County Code, Sec. 68A-5 (a)

Purpose – To advise the County government on all aspects of the program, management, and finances of the urban district. By July 15 each year, advises the department on the program and budget of the urban district; by September 15 each year, reviews the urban district budget and submits comments to the department; and by October 1 each year, meets with the head of the department to resolve areas of disagreement regarding the budget.

Membership – 13 members (if 2 or more Optional Method Developers [OMD]), 12 members (if there is only one OMD); 11 members (if there are no OMDs), including:  
two members who represent the Wheaton/Kensington Chamber of Commerce; two members who represent Wheaton businesses that employ fewer than ten people; two members who represent Wheaton businesses that employ 10 or more people; four members who represent residential communities in the urban district or within 2 miles of the urban district; and one member who represents a residential community either in or outside of the urban district and who is nominated by the Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board. The remaining members represent optional method developers. Note: As of April, 2004, there were no optional method developments (OMDs) in Wheaton.

Comments -- This board has knowledgeable and enthusiastic members and staff, and is successful in meeting its mission. The board does not prepare an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. An annual report should be published.

## COMMISSION FOR WOMEN

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 27-28

Purpose -- To work to remove inequalities due to unmet needs or discrimination or prejudice on the basis of sex in such areas as housing, recreation, employment, education, community services, the legal system, and related matters.

Membership -- 15 members - 9 shall be appointed from applicants who have been nominated and recommended by organizations within the County whose interests relate to the status of women (endorsed) and 6 from among those applicants applying on their own behalf (independent).

Comments-- The Commission for Women is an advisory board that works in conjunction with the Commission for Women (County department with the same name) which provides services to the women of the County. This Commission is a well organized and focused group of active, successful volunteers. It is forceful in advising on and advocating for women's issues to the County Executive and Council, the State of Maryland legislature and the public as a whole. Two initiatives the Commission currently is spearheading are 1) outreach to immigrant women, and 2) promotion of girls in technology by empowerment through education at special computer camps. This commission integrates its activities well with the many services provided by the department, such as counseling for displaced homemakers and education courses on self sufficiency. The Commission produces an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. Continue to share best practices with other B/C/C.

## E. OTHER BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

Each B/C/C that is listed below is not included in any of the other categories because of their unique characteristics.

Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors  
Board of Investment Trustees  
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee  
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors

\* \* \*

## **BETHESDA URBAN PARTNERSHIP, INC. BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Created -- Montgomery County Code Section 68A-10.

Purpose -- The Board directs all aspects of the program, management and finances of the corporation; provides direct involvement of the community of Bethesda in the provision of services in the Bethesda Urban District. The Board also enlists the active interest and financial support of individuals, citizens and civic groups, along with firms and corporations concerned about the improvement of the Urban District, particularly property owners, residents, customers and tenants located within the district, and provides services, in addition to services and facilities that the Montgomery County Government provides generally, for the maintenance and improvement of the streetscape and streetscape amenities on public rights of way, and any property that is used by the general public.

Membership -- The Board of Directors of the Corporation has 11 members which includes the County Executive or his designee as an ex-officio, nonvoting member; two representatives nominated by the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce; three representatives who are, or represent, owners of an optional method developer; one representative who is an owner, partner, proprietor, or corporate officer of a small business; one representative who lives in the urban district; and one representative of a residential community within the planning area and is nominated by the Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board. Other members include a representative who lives in a residential community outside of, but in close proximity to, the urban district, who is appointed by the County Executive from among three candidates nominated by the County Council; and a resident representative of the Western MC Citizens Advisory Board who is nominated by the Board.

Financial Disclosure - Not required.

Terms -- Three years.

Meetings -- Monthly.

Compensation -- None.

Comments -- The BUP Board of Directors functions well, is very effective, and serves an important purpose. An annual report is published.

Recommendation -- Continue. Expand recruitment for more diverse representation.

## **BOARD OF INVESTMENT TRUSTEES**

<u>Created</u> --	Montgomery County Code, Sec. 33-59 through 33-61
<u>Purpose</u> --	Set policy and monitor the investment program for the assets of the Employee Retirement System and, as needed, retain advisors and vendors to perform services. Evaluate results. Adjust the operation of the program to prudently manage these assets to help assure their safety, maximize their value and minimize the cost to the taxpayers.
<u>Membership</u> --	Nine trustees. The County Executive must appoint four ex-officio trustees: the Director of Human Resources; the Director of Finance; the Director of Management and Budget, and the Staff Director of the County Council. The other five trustees are: one representative of the County Council (from a list of 3-5 recommended by the Council), one vested member of the retirement system who is represented by an employee organization <u>or</u> a person recommended by an employee organization (methodology for nominations is in the Code); one active county employee who is vested in the retirement system and the merit system and is not a member of a collective bargaining unit; one retired member of the retirement system (methodology for nominations is in the Code); a member of the public who is knowledgeable in the field of pensions, investments, or financial matters (methodology for nominations is in the Code).
<u>Financial</u>	
<u>Disclosure</u> --	Confidential disclosure required (with limited public).
<u>Terms</u> --	Three years.
<u>Compensation</u> --	None.
<u>Meetings</u> --	Quarterly.
<u>Comments</u> --	The Board of Investment Trustees advises and oversees the County's Employee Retirement System by deciding asset allocation, choosing money managers, evaluating the portfolio results and adjusting the allocations and/or managers who direct these portfolios as necessary. The Board meets quarterly, and its members represent a broad spectrum of concerned interests. It functions very efficiently and fills an important need in an organized and rational manner. The subject matter that the Board addresses can be highly technical and requires a sophisticated understanding of retirement finances. The Board produces two reports, at the end of June and December.
<u>Recommendation</u> --	Continue.

## **DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE**

Created -- Executive Order 82-99

Purpose-- Advise the Executive on plans for an annual program or other activities in observance of the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.; promotes awareness and recognition of the contributions of Dr. King toward the elimination of racial prejudice, inequality, and injustice in America and the achievement of equal rights and human dignity for all Americans; fosters the ideals and goals Dr. King espoused.

Membership -- A maximum of ten (10) general public members plus fifteen (15) agency representatives--one primary and one alternate from the following agencies: Offices of the County Executive, County Council, Recreation, Libraries, M-NCPPC, Montgomery County Public Schools, Montgomery College, Human Rights Commission, Department of Fire and Rescue Services, Department of Police, Office of Public Information, Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation, City of Gaithersburg, City of Takoma Park, and Town of Garrett Park. Membership should be broadly representative of persons of diverse social, cultural, and economic backgrounds in the County.

Financial Disclosure - Not required.

Terms -- 2 years.

Compensation -- None.

Comments -- This Committee has done a good job of planning for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration. Its events have been very successful and well attended in past years, and there is a great deal of collaboration with various county agencies. Although the Committee does evaluate the event, the Committee does not prepare an annual report.

Recommendation -- Continue. Following the annual celebration, a formal report should be issued summarizing the program's successes, lessons learned, and suggestions for the following year's event.

## STRATHMORE HALL FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<u>Created</u> --	Resolution No. 9-1460
<u>Purpose</u> --	To foster and support the development of the Strathmore Hall Arts Center and the effective use of its facilities as a multi-disciplinary center for promoting and encouraging participation in and appreciation of the performing, literary and visual arts.
<u>Membership</u> --	<p>The Board of Directors shall consist of 21 members as follows:</p> <p>Six business, professional or civic leaders with demonstrated interest in the arts and in furthering the purposes of the Foundation shall be appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council.</p> <p>Six members elected in such manner as the Bylaws may prescribe--being selected for their special competence, knowledge, experience or effectiveness in one of the arts, the professions or other productive endeavor relevant to the purposes and activities of the Foundation.</p> <p>Six members elected in such manner as the Bylaws of the Foundation may prescribe from among the membership of the Honorary Trustees.</p> <p>Three members serve as <u>ex officio</u> but with full voting privileges. These members shall include an individual designated by the County Executive, an individual designated by the Montgomery County Council; and, the President, or designee, of the Montgomery County Arts and Humanities Council.</p>
<u>Financial Disclosure</u> --	Not required.
<u>Terms</u> --	Three years.
<u>Meetings</u> --	Alternate months.
<u>Compensation</u> --	None.
<u>Comments</u> --	<p>This Board is in transition, as Strathmore Hall grows from a small arts center to a major entertainment and educational non-profit business. This Board has fund raising as its top priority unlike most other County Boards and Commissions. The County has a significant investment in the success of this business and needs to be sure that the County's nominees understand the importance of raising funds and are willing to undertake this responsibility. The Board publishes an annual report.</p>
<u>Recommendation</u> --	<p>Continue. The CERB also encourages that the Board expand to the level authorized in the bylaws of 30 members, and provide professional fund-raising training to new Board members.</p>

## **CHAPTER IV.**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The recommendations contained in this report are based on CERB member observations, interviews, data analysis and review of individual B/C/C and the system as a whole. The B/C/C system is a large, well-run system that provides significant benefits to the County. It provides an important avenue for public participation and is supported by over 1,200 County residents who volunteer their time, services, expertise and diverse perspectives to County Government.

The B/C/C system is viewed positively by the County Government's staff at all levels, by the County Council, and by the County Executive. As with any large institution, the B/C/C system must change over time to remain effective and to continue to serve the County's needs. The CERB's two-year study has identified key issues that affect the overall B/C/C system and specific findings that affect individual B/C/Cs.

An active and involved citizenry in the affairs of County government is a hallmark of life in Montgomery County. It is essential that the County government utilize this large volunteer resource in the most effective manner possible. It is in this spirit that the CERB has examined the current B/C/C system and offered its recommendations for improvement.

## **INTERIM REPORT**

### **COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

#### **Members**

Michael J. Garr, Co-Chair, of Bethesda  
Betsy W. Jett , Co-Chair, of Gaithersburg  
Anita K. Brady, of Olney  
Adrian Cargill, of Gaithersburg  
Susan Cheney, of Bethesda  
Jacqueline D'Alessio, of Silver Spring  
Howard R. Philips, of Bethesda  
Richard D. Stoll, of Kensington

**June 13, 2003**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>II. ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION</b>	3
A. Staffing	3
B. Training	4
C. Recruitment	4
D. Compensation	5
E. Size	5
F. Attendance and Removal	6
G. Communications	6
H. Effectiveness	7
I. Number of Boards, Committees, and Commissions (B/C/Cs)	7
<b>III. INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	8
A. Continuation of training program	8
B. Modification of recruitment policy	9
C. Temporary halt to creation of new B/C/Cs	9
D. Creation of communications plan for B/C/Cs	9
E. Enactment of uniform removal policy for B/C/Cs	10
<b>IV. CONCLUSION</b>	10
<b>V. ATTACHMENTS</b>	
A. List of B/C/Cs	
B. Charge of Committee Evaluation and Review Board	

**INTERIM REPORT OF 2002-2004 COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

**SECTION I**  
**INTRODUCTION**

The duties and responsibilities of the Committee Evaluation and Review Board (“CERB”) are to review and evaluate the current system of Montgomery County (“County”) boards, committees, and commissions (hereinafter referred to as “B/C/C(s)”). Following its review, the CERB is to recommend changes to individual B/C/Cs and the County B/C/C system as a whole, to the Montgomery County Executive (“County Executive”) and to the Montgomery County Council (“County Council”).

Attachment A contains a list of the B/C/Cs reviewed by the CERB and a list of B/C/Cs not included in the CERB review. The CERB review did not include: (i) ad hoc committees established by the County Executive, County Council, or County Departments; (ii) State-controlled committees; and (iii) newly created B/C/Cs. The CERB charge, which was promulgated by the County Executive, is set forth at Attachment B.

The CERB’s first step in its examination of the B/C/C system was to develop an appropriate review methodology. To accomplish this, the CERB deemed it important to gain a thorough understanding of the CERB charge, the County B/C/C structure, the role of B/C/Cs in County Government, and how individual B/C/Cs function.

Since its inception in March of 2002, the CERB has met with the following individuals:

Marc P. Hansen  
Chief, General Counsel Division  
Office of the County Attorney

Charles S. Short  
Former Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Ronald W. Clarkson  
Community Outreach Manager  
Offices of the County Executive

Robert K. Kendal  
Former Director  
Office of Management and Budget

The CERB also was briefed by Wayne Busbice, former Chairman of the Committee on Committees (the CERB’s predecessor), on the issues faced by that committee as it discharged its duties and responsibilities in the 1991-1992 period. In the summer and fall of 2002, CERB members began attending B/C/C meetings to introduce the CERB.

The CERB, with the assistance of the County's Department of Technology Services, developed and implemented a Web-based data collection online questionnaire ("Questionnaire"). It is designed to gather useful background information on all B/C/Cs from the County staff liaisons ("Staff Liaisons") supporting B/C/Cs. The CERB distributed the Questionnaires in the fall of 2002. To date, approximately 88% of the Questionnaires have been completed and returned. CERB members are reviewing the completed Questionnaires. The responses will be put into a database, which will be available for use by the County and future CERBs, and, with some enhancements, could be adapted for use in routine collection of performance measurement data. For instance, monthly reporting by Staff Liaisons into this Web-based application could provide tracking of metrics such as the: (i) number of current unfilled B/C/C vacancies; (ii) number of B/C/C members; (iii) number of absent members per meeting; (iv) number of qualified applicants for each vacancy; (v) number of staff hours devoted to each B/C/C on a monthly basis; and (vi) amount of money spent on each B/C/C per month. We believe that this would be a valuable tool to monitor and evaluate the ongoing performance of the County B/C/C system after the CERB review is completed next year.

One of our observations to date is that the B/C/C system provides an important avenue for public participation in County Government and allows the County to receive the benefit of the knowledge and experience of the County residents participating in the B/C/C system.

At this mid-point of our two-year study, we have prepared this Interim Report to identify the following issues for the attention of the County Executive and the County Council:

- **Staffing** – The level and type of support provided by Staff Liaisons varies widely from B/C/C to B/C/C.
- **Training** – The County has recently implemented a formalized training program for B/C/C members and Staff Liaisons.
- **Recruitment** – Many B/C/Cs with specific membership categories frequently have difficulty filling vacancies.
- **Compensation** – There are no set criteria for designating which B/C/Cs should receive compensation or the level of compensation that should be paid. Many B/C/C members are not aware of the travel and dependent-care reimbursements that are available to them.
- **Size** – Changes to size and membership structure may help certain B/C/Cs operate with greater effectiveness.
- **Attendance and removal** – The CERB is reviewing the member attendance and removal policies and procedures of all B/C/Cs.
- **Communications** – There are wide discrepancies among the B/C/Cs with regard to communicating with the public, the media, elected officials, other B/C/Cs, and each B/C/C's own members.

- ***Effectiveness*** – The effectiveness of B/C/Cs is being evaluated and recommendations will be included in the CERB’s Final Report.
- ***Number of B/C/Cs*** – The County has significantly more B/C/Cs than any of the surrounding jurisdictions, and a few B/C/Cs appear to have similar or overlapping missions.

Section II of this Interim Report contains an expanded description of each of these issues. Based on its review to date, the CERB is making interim recommendations on the issues it has identified as requiring the immediate attention of the County Executive and County Council. These recommendations are set forth in Section III below.

## **SECTION II**

### **ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION**

#### **A. STAFFING**

Adequate and competent staffing is crucial to the success of B/C/Cs in carrying out their missions. The level and type of support that Staff Liaisons provide varies widely from B/C/C to B/C/C. A survey of Staff Liaisons performed in January 2002 by the County’s Community Relations Manager showed that Staff Liaisons who provide primary support to a B/C/C spent an average of approximately 25% of their working time on that B/C/C’s activities. An additional 100 County employees each contribute an average of 4 hours per week to assist B/C/Cs. When a new B/C/C is created, there is usually no new allocation of human resources to staff it; the support comes from existing County personnel who take it on as an additional job responsibility.

The CERB is considering the following issues regarding B/C/C staffing:

1. Opportunities for more efficient use of Staff Liaisons. The former Director of the County’s Department of Health and Human Services suggested that the Department might be able to improve support with the same number of personnel if one employee staffed more than one B/C/C. This may have the added benefit of improved communication between B/C/Cs with overlapping or related agendas.
2. Human resources requirements for new B/C/Cs. Staffing and other operating costs should be an important consideration when creating new B/C/Cs.
3. Whether Staff Liaisons have the knowledge and tools they need to provide support effectively. At the suggestion of Staff Liaisons during a recent training initiative, the County Executive’s office is now hosting a monthly “brown bag” meeting to encourage sharing of knowledge, ideas, and best practices regarding B/C/C support. The CERB applauds this effort as a promising way for Staff Liaisons to network, learn from each other, and identify opportunities to improve the B/C/C system as a whole.
4. Expectations for the responsibilities of Staff Liaisons. B/C/C members, Staff Liaisons, and County Department managers should have a common expectation for the level of support provided. The B/C/C Policy and Procedures Manual for Staff Liaisons sets forth the basic level of support that a Staff Liaison should provide to a B/C/C. Staff Liaisons should be encouraged to follow this guidance.

## **B. TRAINING**

Although a majority of B/C/Cs provide a new member orientation, the orientation content is inconsistent throughout the B/C/Cs. Some B/C/Cs provide an orientation packet to all new members, other B/C/Cs hold a one-time annual new member orientation, and other B/C/Cs have periodic new member orientation programs held when a new member joins. B/C/C staff liaisons recently received training on the recruitment and appointment process. As part of this training, a packet entitled “Orientation of New Members” was provided, which included a list of information to include and documents to distribute to all new B/C/C members as part of orientation. The CERB will further examine the contents of each B/C/C’s new member orientation and whether important information (*e.g.*, the requirements of the Maryland Open Meetings Act [“Open Meetings Act”] or the County’s Public Ethics Law [“Ethics Law”]) is consistently conveyed throughout all B/C/Cs. In addition, any recent updates on existing policies and procedures should be provided to existing members of B/C/Cs.

B/C/C members and Staff Liaisons believe that overall training for B/C/Cs needs to be more accessible. Training surveys indicated that training should include computer-based instruction, Web seminars, and e-mails of articles with policy updates and relevant training tips. In addition, some B/C/C members expressed a desire to include County training updates for B/C/Cs within their regularly scheduled meetings.

The County has recently implemented training for B/C/C members and Staff Liaisons covering the Ethics Law and the Open Meetings Act. Another training session was held for Staff Liaisons on the B/C/C recruitment and appointment process. Positive participant evaluations were noted, and on-going revisions to the program have been made to ensure practical application of the topics covered in the training. Additional training for B/C/C members in response to their expressed needs is planned throughout the remainder of 2003. Module II training, which is in development, will focus on effective meetings and mission accomplishment.

The CERB is making training recommendations in Section III below.

## **C. RECRUITMENT**

The County frequently has problems filling vacancies on many B/C/Cs with specific categories of membership. Historically, B/C/Cs that have faced great difficulties in filling some or all of these vacancies are required to have members that: (i) are liaisons from another B/C/C, (ii) are from a certain geographic area, (iii) are a member of a certain profession, (iv) possess a certain skill, or (v) require nominations from other organizations or agencies.

The CERB recognizes the County requirement for the appointing authority to consider diversity of background and geographic balance in making appointments to B/C/Cs. Concerns have been raised for the County to be more proactive in the outreach to, and recruitment of, residents of diverse backgrounds. The CERB acknowledges these concerns and encourages additional County efforts in this area. The CERB will be reviewing outreach and recruitment efforts, and will report its findings to the County Executive and County Council. In light of the County’s changing demographics, the CERB encourages County officials to identify and address barriers that inhibit full participation in B/C/Cs by all County residents comprising our richly diverse community.

The members of 18 B/C/Cs are required by law to complete an annual financial disclosure statement. The members of two of those B/C/Cs are also required to submit the financial disclosure statement with the application for membership. Some B/C/Cs have reported that this requirement is a barrier towards filling its vacancies.

The length of time from submission of an application for membership on a B/C/C to appointment can be considerable due to a variety of factors. The CERB will be examining the process and timeline in order to make recommendations in its Final Report.

The B/C/C applications of prospective members are solicited by the County Executive. If an applicant is not appointed to a particular B/C/C, his/her application remains active and may be considered for any additional vacancies that arise within six months of the original recruitment. Once this six-month period has closed, County Council policy requires that a vacancy be advertised again, even if there are qualified applicants still on file. Extending the six-month period would give the appointing authority greater flexibility in matching qualified applicants to openings on B/C/Cs as they arise.

The CERB is making recruitment recommendations in Section III below.

#### **D. COMPENSATION**

The following five B/C/Cs financially compensate their members: (i) Board of Appeals; (ii) Board of Electrical Examiners; (iii) Board of License Commissioners; (iv) Fire and Rescue Commission; and (v) Merit System Protection Board. The Montgomery County Planning Board, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the Washington Suburban Transit Commission and Metro Area Transit Authority also pay their members, but they are excluded from the CERB review.

In its review of B/C/C compensation issues, the CERB will be considering the following factors, among others:

- The need to create an equitable, criteria based compensation program across all B/C/Cs and within each eligible B/C/C. Criteria that may be considered include the following: (i) annual work load; (ii) professional skills required; (iii) nature of responsibilities; (iv) compensation received by a comparable board in a neighboring jurisdiction; (v) compensation received in the open market for performing comparable work; and (vi) difficulty in filling vacancies on a particular B/C/C.
- Reimbursement of B/C/C members for expenses, including travel and dependent care expenses.

#### **E. SIZE**

The CERB is reviewing each B/C/C's size and membership structure with the aim of determining whether changes in the number of members, and/or the use of executive committees and/or subcommittees, may lead to that B/C/C operating with greater effectiveness.

Small B/C/Cs may run into the problem of members participating in informal meetings without complying with the requirements of the Open Meeting Act, and conversely, may be unable to conduct

official business at scheduled meetings if one or two members are absent. Large B/C/Cs with Chairs that do not have strong leadership and meeting management skills may have their own challenges, such as difficulty in running their meetings and reaching a consensus on certain issues.

## **F. ATTENDANCE AND REMOVAL**

As requested by the County Executive, the CERB is reviewing the policy and procedures of all B/C/Cs regarding removal of members. Less than ten B/C/Cs have policies and procedures for removal of a member for reasons other than failure to comply with the attendance requirements. These “other” reasons include neglect of, or inability to perform, the duties of the office, misconduct in office, or serious violation of law. The CERB has identified the need for a uniform removal policy for the removal of a member of a B/C/C for the above-listed reasons, and is making a recommendation on this issue in Section III below.

All B/C/C members are subject to the County regulation providing for the “automatic resignation” of a B/C/C member who is absent from 25% or more of the B/C/C’s scheduled meetings or hearings during any six-month period. When a member resigns through absence, the presiding officer of the B/C/C must promptly notify the appointing authority and all members of the B/C/C. The appointing authority may waive the resignation for illness, emergency, or other good cause. This regulation is not consistently applied across B/C/Cs. Some B/C/Cs are not aware of the regulation, while others give absent members an “excused absence” for a variety of reasons.

Many concerns have been raised regarding the current attendance policy. A few B/C/Cs have expressed a concern that the attendance policy does not provide the flexibility they need to accomplish their goals. Attendance at meetings may not accurately reflect an individual member’s level of participation and contribution. Some B/C/Cs would prefer that member removal for failure to comply with the attendance policy be at the discretion of the Chair, while others would like to see the percentage of missed meetings used to trigger removal be greater than 25%. The CERB will be considering modifications to the attendance policy and the ways in which the policy can be uniformly applied and enforced.

## **G. COMMUNICATIONS**

The CERB has found a wide discrepancy among the numerous B/C/Cs with regard to communicating with the public, media, elected officials, other B/C/Cs, and its own members. Many benefits could be realized through the development of common communications procedures and the increased use of new technologies to distribute information.

The CERB recognizes the need for B/C/Cs to develop and utilize common communications procedures for dealing with the public, media, elected officials, other B/C/Cs, and County and state government. Such procedures could include the creation of a template for B/C/C use in connection with the County’s annual reporting requirement, and integration and communication between the County’s Office of Intergovernmental Affairs and all B/C/Cs. This would ensure that the County is informed about recommendations and proposed actions being considered by B/C/Cs that may impact the County’s message to state and/or federal officials.

Many B/C/Cs, but not all, have not taken advantage of new technologies to distribute information, including Web sites, Internet chat rooms, and the County e-mail system. The County has a

very knowledgeable staff in its Department of Technology Services, with access to many technological resources.

The CERB is making communications recommendations in Section III below.

## **H. EFFECTIVENESS**

Effectiveness in the public policy arena can be difficult to ascertain. We recognize the challenges that lie ahead as we seek to evaluate the effectiveness of B/C/Cs. Equally difficult will be establishing the relationship between each B/C/C's cost and effectiveness. However, we believe this information will be useful, especially when taken as a whole across all B/C/Cs. The CERB will attempt to estimate the average total cost to staff a B/C/C.

There is clearly positive value in citizen participation and involvement, so we will also consider this factor in our evaluation.

We have developed an interview guide, which will be used consistently throughout the remainder of our work. The guide includes questions relating to a B/C/C's objectives and achievements; actions and initiatives undertaken to influence policy-making within each B/C/C's jurisdiction; outreach efforts to citizens and other public groups; and the degree to which each B/C/C meets the County's annual reporting requirement.

## **I. NUMBER OF B/C/Cs**

The County currently has 82 B/C/Cs, comprised of over 1,200 members. The County's number of B/C/Cs far exceeds the number in other jurisdictions that we surveyed. The County B/C/C system provides a valuable opportunity for citizens to participate in local government. However, it is also a large and complex system to manage. The benefits of maintaining the current number of B/C/Cs will be weighed against the potential benefits of merging B/C/Cs with related missions. The CERB will also look at the B/C/C systems in neighboring counties to see if any of those models would be appropriate and beneficial in our setting.



### **SECTION III**

#### **INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS**

##### **A. CONTINUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM**

The CERB strongly recommends that the County continue to provide training to Staff Liaisons and B/C/C members, and commit the financial resources to support the continued implementation and future growth of a formalized training program. The CERB also recommends expanding training opportunities through use of e-mail and non-traditional instructional strategies to increase accessibility to all B/C/C members and Staff Liaisons.

The CERB suggests that the County's training program for B/C/Cs be expanded to include the following six areas:

1.     Basic Responsibilities – The training would explore the basic responsibilities of B/C/Cs, including a discussion of the B/C/C mission and purpose, a review of County policies and procedures, and a review of member and Staff Liaison roles and responsibilities.
2.     Structure and Practices – The training would include practical guidelines on structural issues such as running meetings, subcommittee and executive committee structure and size, parliamentary procedure basics, decision making, bylaws review, and communications (formal and informal).
3.     Budget Responsibilities – The training would provide B/C/C members with an understanding of the County's organizational structure and how the County's Operating and Capital Improvement Program ("CIP") budgets are developed, including related timeframes. Additionally, the roles of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations and the State Legislature will also be explained. The goal of the training would be to help B/C/Cs better understand how the Operating and CIP budget process works, and how each B/C/C can provide input into the process.
4.     Leadership Roles - B/C/C members would learn strategies for effective meeting facilitation and leadership to allow them to build a cohesive team. This training clarifies the difference between the multiple roles on B/C/Cs, including member, Chair and Staff Liaison. Members would also discover ways to manage group processes effectively.
5.     Legal and Ethical Responsibilities - All B/C/C members should understand their B/C/C's legal responsibilities and member responsibilities under the Open Meetings Act and the Ethics Law. These topics are included in the training program recently implemented, and should be continued.
6.     Recruitment, Selection and Interview Techniques - This training would teach strategies to increase members' confidence and competence in interviewing and recommending the best candidates for their B/C/C. It will also cover the process and procedures developed by the County Executive's office in these areas. Members will learn to avoid asking illegal or inappropriate interview questions, and will be reminded that their role in the process is an advisory one.

In February 2003, the Offices of the County Executive began hosting monthly “brown bag” networking sessions for staff liaisons of B/C/Cs so that they may share best practices and lessons learned. The CERB recommends that this new initiative be continued and expanded among different B/C/Cs.

## **B. MODIFICATION OF RECRUITMENT POLICY**

The CERB recommends that the County Council modify its existing policy of having B/C/C vacancies advertised within six months prior to appointment, by increasing the length of time to 12 months. This would give the appointing authority greater flexibility in matching qualified applicants to openings on B/C/Cs as they arise.

## **C. TEMPORARY HALT TO CREATION OF NEW B/C/Cs**

Each new B/C/C created by County Council imposes increased demands on the budget of the department to which they report, and on the time and efforts of Staff Liaisons. Eight B/C/Cs have been created within the last two years, with no provision for additional funding of their activities or the hiring of new Staff Liaisons to support their needs. In addition, the CERB is examining the possibility that non-budgeted operating costs to support B/C/Cs may be greater than previously expected.

The CERB recommends that the County Executive and the County Council refrain from creating new B/C/Cs until the CERB has completed its study, which is expected to occur in the Spring of 2004. We recognize that a new issue or activity may emerge that needs to be addressed immediately, which, in the past, may have been the impetus for the creation of a new B/C/C. If this situation should arise within the next year, the CERB recommends that these new issues be assigned to one or more of the existing B/C/Cs.

## **D. COMMUNICATIONS PLAN FOR B/C/Cs**

The CERB recommends the following regarding communications:

1. The County Executive task the Department of Technology Services to work with the CERB to create a “master communications plan” for B/C/Cs, which will identify both short term and long term communications goals and funding levels to achieve the goals.
2. Better integration with the County’s Office of Intergovernmental Relations and B/C/Cs to ensure that the County is informed about recommendations and proposed actions being considered by B/C/Cs that may impact County government operations and state legislative actions.
3. The creation of a uniform annual report template for use by all B/C/Cs. If requested, the CERB will create the template with input from the County Council and the County Executive on its form and content.

**E. ENACTMENT OF UNIFORM REMOVAL POLICY**

The CERB recommends adoption of a uniform removal policy for B/C/C members. The uniform removal policy should provide for:

- (i) removal at the request of the appointing authority (*i.e.*, the County Executive or the County Council) for neglect of duty, misconduct in office, disability that renders the member unable to perform the duties of office, conduct that impairs a member's ability to perform the duties of office, and violations of law;
- (ii) removal by the appointing authority, at the request of a majority of the members of the B/C/C, for reasons identified in subsection (i);
- (iii) the member to receive written notice of the reason for the removal; and
- (iv) the member to have the opportunity to be heard.

The CERB recognizes that any recommended removal policies would need to be approved by the appropriate County authorities.

**CONCLUSION**

The CERB welcomes any feedback from the County Executive and the County Council on the matters addressed in this Interim Report. The Final Report is expected to be delivered in the spring of 2004.

The CERB appreciates the support it has received from the County Executive, County Council, the Chairs and other B/C/C members, and Staff Liaisons and other County employees, in conducting its review over the last year.

ATTACHMENT A

MONTGOMERY COUNTY'S  
BOARDS, COMMITTEES, AND COMMISSIONS

Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

*(#) Indicates number of members*

Adult Public Guardianship Review Board (11)  
Commission on Aging (no less than 18)  
Agricultural Advisory Committee (15)  
Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board (5)  
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council (25)  
Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board (5)  
Animal Matters Hearing Board (10)  
Board of Appeals (5)  
Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors (11)  
Cable Communications Advisory Committee (13-19)  
Charter Review Commission (11)  
Citizens' Review Panel for Children (7) and Advisory Group (5)  
Commission on Child Care (23-25)  
Commission on Children and Youth (27)  
Commission on Common Ownership Communities (21)  
Community Action Board (27-39)  
Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs (9)  
Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (26)  
East County Citizens Advisory Board (18)  
Board of Electrical Examiners (5)  
Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee (15)  
Ethics Commission (5)  
Committee for Ethnic Affairs (26)  
Facilities Implementation Group (18)  
Fire and Rescue Commission (7)  
Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee (23)  
Committee on Hate/Violence (21)  
Commission on Health (19)  
Historic Preservation Commission (9)  
Housing Opportunities Commission (7)  
Human Rights Commission (15)  
Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities (12)  
Board of Investment Trustees (9)  
Commission on Juvenile Justice (33)  
Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (15)  
Library Board (12)  
Board of License Commissioners (5)  
Mental Health Advisory Committee (22)

Merit System Protection Board (3)  
Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board (15)  
Noise Control Advisory Board (11)  
Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence (7)  
Commission on People with Disabilities (31)  
Range Approval Committee (7)  
Recreation Advisory Boards –  
    County-wide (31); Upcounty (11); Midcounty (11); Silver Spring (11);  
    East County (11); and Western Montgomery County (11)  
Board of Registration for Building Contractors (5)  
Revenue Authority (5)  
Rustic Roads Advisory Committee (7)  
Sign Review Board (3)  
Silver Spring Center Citizens Advisory Board (18)  
Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee (16)  
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee (8)  
Board of Social Services (13)  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (16)  
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors (21)  
Taxicab Service Advisory Committee (9)  
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board (20)  
Victim Services Advisory Board (22)  
Water Quality Advisory Group (18)  
Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board (15)  
Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee (11-13)  
Commission for Women (15)  
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee (25)

Not Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

Airpark Liaison Committee  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
    (Montgomery County Planning Board)  
Property Tax Assessment Appeals Board  
Technology Investment Fund/Loan Grant Committee  
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)  
    (3 from Montgomery County)  
Washington Suburban Transit Commission (WSTC)  
    (3 from Montgomery County; 1 Appointed by the Governor; 2 by the County  
    Executive)

Recently Created B/C/Cs not Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

Cable Compliance Commission  
Long Branch Task Force  
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee  
Workforce Investment Board

**ATTACHMENT B**

**COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND REVIEW BOARD**

**CHARGE TO THE BOARD:**

- 1) Review individual boards, committees, and commissions (b/c/cs) with regard to their mission, membership number and structure, orientation of new members, and effectiveness in completing their mission.
- 2) Review the Montgomery County boards, committees, and commissions (b/c/cs) system as a whole and provide feedback and recommendations to the County Executive and the County Council especially in the following areas:
  - the number of boards, committees, and commission – Are there any b/c/cs that are no longer needed and should be eliminated? Are there any that could be consolidated with others due to duplication or overlap of mission? If so, which ones do you recommend for elimination or consolidation and why?
  - recruitment process for boards, committees, and commissions – What suggestions do you have to improve recruitment for members of boards, committees, and commissions? Identify obstacles to recruitment and recommend methods to overcome them. What suggestions do you have regarding the interview process for applicants?
  - compensation and benefits for boards, committees, and commissions – Are there any b/c/cs currently not compensated that should be? If so, which ones and what is the rationale for compensating these members? Review current benefits and identify any changes you would recommend.
  - attendance policy – What suggestions, if any, do you have for changing the County's attendance policy for b/c/cs?
  - training -- What training needs can you identify for staff, chairs, and members of b/c/cs?
  - staffing – Evaluate the staffing provided to each b/c/c and make recommendations regarding appropriate staffing levels for same. What are the roles and responsibilities of staff to b/c/cs? Are there consistencies/inconsistencies in staffing levels and staffing responsibilities? Evaluate staffing expectations of members of b/c/cs and the expectations of the County departments that provide the staffing.
  - cost/benefits – evaluate the costs and benefits to the County of each of the boards/committees/commissions.
  - removal of members—should Montgomery County enact a statute providing for removal of members of b/c/cs? If so, what criteria for removal should be included? What process should be followed, and who can remove members?

(Note: This listing has been amended since it was submitted in the Interim Report)

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY'S  
BOARDS, COMMITTEES, AND COMMISSIONS  
2003-2004**

Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

*(#) Indicates number of members*

Adult Public Guardianship Review Board (11)  
Commission on Aging (no less than 18)  
Agricultural Advisory Committee (15)  
Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board (5)  
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Advisory Council (25)  
Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board (5)  
Animal Matters Hearing Board (10)  
Board of Appeals (5)  
Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors (11)  
Cable Communications Advisory Committee (13-19)  
Charter Review Commission (11)  
Citizens' Review Panel for Children (7)  
Citizens' Review Panel Advisory Group (5)  
Commission on Child Care (23-25)  
Commission on Children and Youth (27)  
Commission on Common Ownership Communities (21)  
Community Action Board (27-39)  
Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs (9)  
Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (26)  
East County Citizens Advisory Board (18)  
Board of Electrical Examiners (5)  
Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee (15)  
Ethics Commission (5)  
Committee for Ethnic Affairs (26)  
Facilities Implementation Group (18)  
Fire and Rescue Commission (7)  
Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee (23)  
Committee on Hate/Violence (21)  
Commission on Health (19)  
Historic Preservation Commission (9)  
Housing Opportunities Commission (7)  
Human Rights Commission (15)  
Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities (12)  
Board of Investment Trustees (9)  
Commission on Juvenile Justice (33)  
Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (15)  
Library Board (12)  
Board of License Commissioners (5)

## APPENDIX B

Mental Health Advisory Committee (22)  
Merit System Protection Board (3)  
Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board (15)  
Noise Control Advisory Board (11)  
Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence (7)  
Commission on People with Disabilities (31)  
Range Approval Committee (7)  
Recreation Advisory Boards –  
    County-wide (31); Upcounty (11); Midcounty (11); Silver Spring (11);  
    East County (11); and Western Montgomery County (11)  
Board of Registration for Building Contractors (5)  
Revenue Authority (5)  
Rustic Roads Advisory Committee (7)  
Sign Review Board (3)  
Silver Spring Center Citizens Advisory Board (18)  
Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee (16)  
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee (8)  
Board of Social Services (13)  
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (16)  
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors (21)  
Taxicab Service Advisory Committee (9)  
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board (20)  
Victim Services Advisory Board (22)  
Water Quality Advisory Group (18)  
Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board (15)  
Wheaton Urban District Advisory Committee (11-13)  
Commission for Women (15)  
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Commemorative Committee (25)

# of b/c/c CERB reviewed - 68

### Not Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

Airpark Liaison Committee  
Community Development Advisory Committee  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
    (Montgomery County Planning Board)  
Nominating Committee for the Board of Trustees of Montgomery College  
Property Tax Assessment Appeals Board  
Technology Investment Fund/Loan Grant Committee  
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)  
Washington Suburban Transit Commission (WSTC)

### Recently Created B/C/Cs not Reviewed by the Committee Evaluation and Review Board

Arts & Entertainment District Advisory Panel  
Cable Compliance Commission  
Glen Echo Park Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors  
Local Management Board for Children, Youth, and Families  
Long Branch Task Force  
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee  
Workforce Investment Board

# b/c/c not reviewed = 15

Total b/c/c = 83



**B/C/C Questionnaire #2  
STAFF**

BCC: \_\_\_\_\_  
Person \_\_\_\_\_  
Interviewed \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Title \_\_\_\_\_

**B/C/C Policies and Procedures  
Recruitment**

1. Do you have hard to fill positions? Why are they hard to fill?
2. Does your membership reflect the diversity of Montgomery County?
3. Should there be a standardized application form?
4. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the recruitment process?

**Attendance**

5. Does your B/C/C record and monitor attendance?
6. Is the current policy (absence from  $\geq 25\%$  of scheduled meetings in 6 month period = resignation) appropriate?
7. Does your B/C/C enforce the attendance policy?
8. Do you have any alternative suggestions?
9. Does your committee allow for "virtual" attendance via teleconferencing or videoconferencing? Is it effective?

**Removal**

10. Has your B/C/C had a problem related to removal of members? If so, please describe.

**B/C/C Resources and Support  
Staffing**

11. What are the most critical services that staff provide or should provide?
12. Is the current level of staffing adequate for your B/C/C?

**Training**

13. Does your B/C/C offer new member orientation? If yes, please describe.
14. Is there any ongoing training provided that is specific to your B/C/C? If yes, what? How do you fund it?

**B/C/C Mission and Effectiveness**

**All B/C/Cs**

- 15. Do you feel that the charter/mission of your B/C/C is clearly defined?
- 16. In your judgment, what are the 3 most important objectives of your B/C/C?
- 17. Do you think that the B/C/C has been successful in achieving these objectives?  
Please explain.

**Adjudicatory, Licensing, and Program Direction B/C/Cs**

- 18. How many cases does your B/C/C process annually? How many cases were appealed? Were your B/C/C's decisions sustained or over-ruled?
- 19. What formal reporting requirements does your B/C/C have? Please discuss the complexity, authorship, and timing of your reports.
- 20. How do staff contribute to case examinations and recommendations?

**B/C/C Questionnaire #2**

**CHAIRS**

BCC: \_\_\_\_\_  
Person \_\_\_\_\_  
Interviewed \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Date \_\_\_\_\_

Years served on B/C/C \_\_\_\_\_

**B/C/C Policies and Procedures**

**Recruitment**

1. Do you have hard to fill positions? Why are they hard to fill?
2. Does your membership reflect the diversity of Montgomery County?
3. Should there be a standardized application form?
4. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the recruitment process?

**Attendance**

5. Is the current policy (absence from  $\geq 25\%$  of scheduled meetings in 6 month period = resignation) appropriate?
6. Does your B/C/C enforce the attendance policy?
7. Do you have any alternative suggestions?
8. Does your committee allow for "virtual" attendance via teleconferencing or videoconferencing? Is it effective?

**Removal**

9. Has your B/C/C had a problem related to removal of members? If so, please describe.

**B/C/C Resources and Support**

**Staffing**

10. What are the most critical services that staff provide or should provide?
11. Is the current level of staffing adequate for your B/C/C?

**Training**

12. What training delivery methods would work best for your committee (e.g., in-person, video, computer based, written materials, etc)?

**Compensation**

- 13. Do you think your B/C/C should be compensated? Why?
- 14. What do you think are valid reasons for compensation?

**B/C/C Mission and Effectiveness**

**All B/C/Cs**

- 15. Do you feel that the charter/mission of your B/C/C is clearly defined?
- 16. In your opinion, how well does your B/C/C meet its charter/mission?  
Where does it fall short and why?
- 17. In your judgment, what are the 3 most important objectives of your B/C/C?
- 18. Do you think that the B/C/C has been successful in achieving these objectives? Please explain.
- 19. What is the average monthly time demand per member for meetings, hearings, deliberations, etc? How much additional outside time is generally required per member to accomplish the official duties of the B/C/C?

**Advisory B/C/Cs**

- 20. Does the department/agency proactively seek the B/C/C's advice and counsel on issues as part of the decision/policy-making process? Can you provide some examples? If no, please explain why not.
- 21. Does the B/C/C identify issues and make recommendations for action? Can you provide examples? Do these proposals impact policy/decision making in County Government?
- 22. Does the B/C/C seek out and make common cause with other relevant B/C/Cs in matters of mutual interest? If yes, has this been effective?

**Adjudicatory, Licensing, and Program Direction B/C/Cs**

- 23. What formal reporting requirements does your B/C/C have? Please discuss the complexity, authorship, and timing of your reports.
- 24. How do staff contribute to case examinations and recommendations?

**B/C/C Questionnaire #2****MEMBERS**

BCC: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Person \_\_\_\_\_  
 Interviewed \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Years served on B/C/C \_\_\_\_\_

**B/C/C Policies and Procedures****Recruitment**

1. Should there be a standardized application form?
2. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the recruitment process?

**Attendance**

3. Is the current policy (absence from  $\geq 25\%$  of scheduled meetings in 6 month period = resignation) appropriate?
4. Do you have any alternative suggestions?

**B/C/C Resources and Support****Compensation**

5. Do you think your B/C/C should be compensated? Why?
6. What do you think are valid reasons for compensation?

**B/C/C Mission and Effectiveness****All B/C/Cs**

7. Do you feel that the charter/mission of your B/C/C is clearly defined?
8. In your judgment, what are the 3 most important objectives of your B/C/C?
9. Do you think that the B/C/C has been successful in achieving these objectives? Please explain.
10. What is the average monthly time demand per member for meetings, hearings, deliberations, etc? How much additional outside time is generally required per member to accomplish the official duties of the B/C/C?

**B/C/C Questionnaire #2**

**DEPARTMENT HEADS**

BCC: \_\_\_\_\_  
Person \_\_\_\_\_  
Interviewed \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Title \_\_\_\_\_

**B/C/C Mission and Effectiveness**

**All B/C/Cs**

1. Do you feel that the charter/mission of your B/C/C is clearly defined?
2. In your opinion, how well does your B/C/C meet its charter/mission? Where does it fall short and why?
3. Do you feel that the charter/mission of the B/C/C is relevant to the functions of your department or to current issues facing County government?
4. In your judgment, what are the 3 most important objectives of your B/C/C?
5. Do you think that the B/C/C has been successful in achieving these objectives? Please explain.
6. What would be the impact on government and the community if the B/C/C were merged with another committee or abolished?

**7. Advisory B/C/Cs**

8. Does the department/agency proactively seek the B/C/C's advice and counsel on issues as part of the decision/policy-making process? Can you provide some examples? If no, please explain why not.
9. Does the B/C/C identify issues and make recommendations for action? Can you provide examples? Do these proposals impact policy/decision making in County Government?
10. Does the B/C/C seek out and make common cause with other relevant B/C/Cs in matters of mutual interest? If yes, has this been effective?

## **APPENDIX D-1**

### **Survey Summaries of Neighboring Jurisdictions Completed by Shirley Kemelhor January 2004**

#### **A. Survey questions**

1. Are there specific requirements for being a member on one of your County's boards, committees and commissions? If yes, please explain (i.e., residency, work in the County, others such as specific categories of membership for a board).
2. Are there specific requirements to establish a board? Are most established by County Code? If not, what is your formal process for creating a board?
3. Are sunset dates established for your boards?
4. If not, do you conduct reviews to determine if a board is still providing a useful function for your County?
5. Do you have difficulty abolishing boards?
6. Do you have any boards that perform a function that could be done by staff? If so, please provide the name(s). What is the rationale for a board to do this type of work in lieu of staff?
7. What is the extent of staff support provided to boards? What are the required duties that staff carries out? Do most B/C/Cs have one staff member attend meetings or more than one?
8. How many of your boards receive compensation? Please list the ones that do, and explain why they are compensated.
9. How many and which of your boards are required to file annual financial disclosure forms? Do members file as part of their application or only after they are appointed?
10. MC has 83 boards and your county has \_\_\_\_\_. Does your county have a limit or policy on the number of boards?
11. After comparing MC's boards to your County's, we noticed that you do not have a board for \_\_\_\_\_ – how do you handle these issues?
12. Are boards required to complete annual reports? Is there a standard format for them?
13. How does your county evaluate a board's effectiveness?
14. How do you recruit members? Is there an application form?
15. Is there any special outreach done to insure that underrepresented minority populations are represented on boards?

## APPENDIX D-2

### b. General Findings

1. All Maryland counties have some form of Adult Public Guardianship. Virginia counties may take care of this through the Health Systems Agency Board, Human Services Commission or Task Force. Fairfax has a Long-Term Care Coordinating Commission but this Commission has a different function.
2. All jurisdictions have a Commission on Aging.
3. All except Anne Arundel have a Board of Appeals.
4. All except Arlington have an Animal Matters Hearing Board.
5. None seem to have a Commission on Common Ownership Communities.
6. All except Fairfax and Arlington have an Ethics Commission.
7. All have a Human Rights Commission.
8. Most have a Library Board and a Planning Board.
9. All have a Commission on People with Disabilities.
10. All have a Property Tax Assessment Appeals Board.
11. All have Recreation Advisory Boards, but not the number we have.
12. All except Arlington have a Board of Social Services.
13. Most have Special Boards for special areas; e.g., Glen Echo Park Partnership, and Bethesda Urban Partnership
14. Most have a Personnel Board.
15. Most don't seem to have as many boards as MC dealing with children and juveniles.
16. Some have boards that we don't – see Fairfax list.
17. It seems that many of these boards are created as the need arises (e.g., Fairfax).
18. Name of the Board doesn't necessarily describe duties.



**C. Specific Findings from Survey of Neighboring Jurisdictions – January 2004**

<b>County</b> <b>Questions</b>	<b>Anne Arundel</b>	<b>Baltimore</b>	<b>Howard</b>	<b>Prince Georges</b>	<b>Fairfax</b>	<b>Arlington</b>
# B/C/Cs	45	35	34	51	73	42
1. Specific membership requirements?	Varies, residency not specifically required; some require subject matter experts, union reps	Specific requirements written into Code	Live or Work in county; some have additional requirements	Varies, most do not specify residency	Residency; some B/C/Cs have other requirements	Live or Work in county
2. How are B/C/Cs established?	County Code, County Executive or County Council	Some by Executive Order, some by Code, some by state or federal law	County Code or state legislation		No formal process; some through Board of Supervisors	Some by statute; most by County Board
3. Are there sunset provisions?	Yes for some, No for most	No	No	Most have expiration dates	Not for B/C/Cs; yes for task forces	Not for B/C/Cs; yes for some task forces
4. Is there a review process for B/C/Cs?	Through staff reports	Reviewed by departments	Yes	No	No	No
5. Is it difficult to abolish B/C/Cs?			One in process, but needs State approval		Yes	None abolished in last 6 years, but a few have been consolidated
6. Boards that perform functions of staff?	No	No	No		No	No

**APPENDIX D-3**

<b>County</b> <b>Questions</b>	<b>Anne Arundel</b>	<b>Baltimore</b>	<b>Howard</b>	<b>Prince Georges</b>	<b>Fairfax</b>	<b>Arlington</b>
7. Level of staff support?	One staff member attends meetings	Varies	At least 1 staff member for each B/C/C acts as executive secretary	Most have some staff support	Level of support varies widely between B/C/Cs	At discretion of County manager
8. How many compensated and why?	1	Some (at least 4); depends on complexity and magnitude of work	1	About 7 or 8	10; usually those with fiduciary responsibility; Planning Board members receive \$15,000/year; other B/C/Cs receive around \$100/meeting	1
9. How many require financial disclosure?	Some; required after appointment	Some	18; required before appointment		All	12
10. Limit on total # of B/C/Cs?	No		No	No	No	No
11. How are issues handled if no B/C/C equivalent to one in Montgomery County?			Covered by other B/C/Cs	Covered by other B/C/Cs	Covered by other B/C/Cs or County staff	Animal matters contracted; other issues covered by other existing B/C/Cs
12. Annual report required? Standard format?	No	Not required, but many B/C/Cs prepare one anyway	Yes; No standard format	Depends on by-laws of B/C/C	For some B/C/Cs;	Yes; No standard format

# APPENDIX D-3

County Questions	Anne Arundel	Baltimore	Howard	Prince Georges	Fairfax	Arlington
13. How is B/C/C effectiveness evaluated?	At discretion of Agency Head and staff	Evaluated by staff office to which the B/C/C reports	Citizen response, staff feedback, department feedback		No formal process	No formal process; hear from B/C/Cs regularly
14. How do you recruit? Standard application form?	Referrals from Council or Chair; some citizens inquire by phone	Usually through staff referrals; standard application form used	By word of mouth, through non-profit agencies, and news media	Internet; many citizens inquire by phone; resumes are held until opening is available, then additional application materials are requested	Depends on the B/C/C, usually on-line or newspaper; no standard form	On-line; no standard form
15. Outreach to recruit under-represented populations?	Contact various organizations		Contact minority organizations	Yes	Outreach is by individual B/C/Cs	Notices in "Arlington Citizen"; through community leaders; "Arlington Neighborhood College" graduates

<b>B/C/C in Montgomery County</b>	<b>Anne Arundel (45 bds)</b>	<b>Balto. County (35 bds)</b>	<b>Howard County (34 bds)</b>	<b>P.G. County (51 bds)</b>	<b>Fairfax County (73 bds)</b>	<b>Arlington Co. (42 bds)</b>	<b>Notes/Comments</b>
Adult Public Guardianship Review Board (11)	X	X	X	X			All in MD have; Virginia NO
<i>Airpark Liaison Committee*</i> (16)	X						
Arts & Entertainment District Advisory Panel (7)	X	X				X	Others are “cultural arts” committees
Commission on Aging (no less than 18)	X	X	X	X	X	X	All have
Agricultural Advisory Committee (15)		X		X	X		
Agricultural Preservation Advisory Board (5)	X	X	X	X			
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Adv Council (25)	X	X	X				
Alcoholic Beverages Advisory Board (5)	X		X				
Animal Matters Hearing Board (10) ♦(C)	X	X	X	X	X		All except Arlington
<i>Board of Appeals*</i> (5) ♦(P)		X	X	X	X	X	
Bethesda Urban Partnership, Inc. Board of Directors (11)							Unique to MC
Cable Communications Advisory Committee (13-19) ♦(C)			X	X		X	
Cable Compliance Commission (5) ♦(C)							Only in MC
Charter Review Commission** (11)				X			
Citizens’ Review Panel for Children (7) and Advisory Group (5)	1 on all Children & Youth issues	X	X		X		
Commission on Child Care (23-25)		X				X	
Commission on Children and Youth (27)		X	X	X		X	
Committee Evaluation and Review Board (9)							Only in MC
Commission on Common Ownership Communities (21) ♦(C)							Only in MC
Community Action Board (27-39)					X	X	
Advisory Committee on Consumer Affairs (9)		X	X		X		
Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission (26)							Unique to MC; not included in CERB Study
Commission on Crossroads Development (21)							
East County Citizens Advisory Board (18)	X					X	2 jurisdictions have a general citizens advisory committee
Board of Electrical Examiners (5) ♦(C)	X	X	X	X	X		
Energy and Air Quality Advisory Committee (15)	X				X	X	Anne Arundel’s – Environmental Cmte.
Ethics Commission (5) ♦(P)	X	X	X	X			All MD: none in VA

<b>MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MC) BCC NAME</b>	<b>Anne Arundel</b>	<b>Balto. County</b>	<b>Howard County</b>	<b>P.G. County</b>	<b>Fairfax County</b>	<b>Arlington Co.</b>	
Committee for Ethnic Affairs (26)		X				X	Only Arlington and Baltimore have
Facilities Implementation Group (18)							Unique to MC
Fire and Rescue Commission (7) ♦(C)	X		X		X	X	
Friendship Heights TMD Advisory Committee (23)							Unique to MC
Glen Echo Park Partnership Board of Directors (9-25)							Unique to MC
Committee on Hate/Violence (21)							None have.
Commission on Health (19)		X	X		X	X	
Historic Preservation Commission (9) ♦(C)		X	X	X	X	X	
Housing Opportunities Commission (7) ♦(P)	X		X	X(BROADER)	X		
Human Rights Commission and Case Review Board (15) ♦(C)	X	X	X	X	X	X	All have.
Interagency Coordinating Board for Community Use of Public Facilities (12)							Only in MC
Board of Investment Trustees (9) ♦(C)	X			X	X	X	
Commission on Juvenile Justice (33)					X		Only in Fairfax
Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (15) ♦(C)					X	X	
Library Board (12)		X	X	X	X		
Long Branch Task Force (37)							Unique to MC
Board of License Commissioners (5) ♦(P)	X	X	X	X			
<i>Montgomery County Planning Board*</i> (5) ♦	X	X	X		X	X	
Mental Health Advisory Committee (22)	X	X	X	X			
<i>Merit System Protection Board*</i> (3) ♦(P)				X			
Mid-County Citizens Advisory Board (15)							Unique to MC
Noise Control Advisory Board (11)							None have.
Partnership Board for Victims of Hate/Violence (7)							None have
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee (17)							None have; Arlington has Traffic Board
Commission on People with Disabilities (31)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Department of Permitting Services Advisory Committee (17)							Unique to MC – not included in CERB study.
Property Tax Assessment Appeals Board (4)	X	X	X	X	X	X	All have
Range Approval Committee (7)							None have.

<b>MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MC) BCC NAME</b>	<b>Anne Arundel</b>	<b>Balto. County</b>	<b>Howard County</b>	<b>P.G. County</b>	<b>Fairfax County</b>	<b>Arlington Co.</b>	
Recreation Advisory Boards – County-wide (31)	X	X	X	X	X	X	All have
Mid-County (11); Silver Spring (11); East County (11), and Western Area (11); Upcounty (11) REGIONAL REC BOARDS							None have.
Board of Registration for Building Contractors (5) (C)		X					Anne Arundel has a Violations Review Board
Revenue Authority (5) ((P)		X		X			
Rustic Roads Advisory Committee (7)							Only in MC
Sign Review Board (3) (C)					X		
Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board (18)							Unique to MC
Silver Spring Civic Building Steering Committee							Unique to MC
Silver Spring Transportation System Management Advisory Committee (16)							Unique to MC: Howard, Fairfax and Arlington have something similar
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee (8)							Unique to MC
Board of Social Services (13) (C)	X	X	X	X	X		All except Arlington
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (16)			X				
Strathmore Hall Foundation Board of Directors (21)							Unique to MC
Taxicab Service Advisory Committee (9) (C)				X			PG only other County
Technology Investment Fund Loan/Grant Committee (7)					X		Fairfax only other County
Upcounty Citizens Advisory Board (20)							Unique to MC
Victim Services Advisory Board (22)							Only in MC
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) (7)				X			Not included in CERB study
Washington Suburban Transit Commission (WSTC) (6)				X			Not included in CERB study
Water Quality Advisory Group (18)					X		Fairfax only
Western Montgomery County Citizens Advisory Board (15)							Unique to MC

MONTGOMERY COUNTY BCC NAME	Anne Arundel	Balto. County	Harford County	Howard County	P.G. County	Fairfax County	Arlington Co.	
Commission for Women (15)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	All have
Workforce Investment Board (32)	X	X					X	
Dr. ML King, Jr. Comm. (25) – not conf. by CC				X				
<b>OTHER BOARDS NOT INCLUDED IN CERB’S REVIEW APPTED BY THE CE AND NOT CONFIRMED BY CC</b>								
Action Business Committee	Minority Adv. Council	Minority Adv. Council						
African Am. Adv. Group								
Asian Adv. Group								
Asian Am. Business Development Council								
Comm. Development Adv. Committee								
Conf. Center Liaison Cmte.								
Coop. Extension Adv. Council								
Economic Adv. Council	X							
Latino/Hispanic Adv. Group								
Nom. Cmte. For Bd. Of Trustees of Montg. College								
SS Civic Bldg. Steering Cmte.								
Weed Control Cmte.								
Wheaton Redevelopment Steering Committee								
Youth Adv. Com. (Recreation)								

“Only in MC” comment means that it could be in others but is not.  
“Unique to MC” comment means that it is specific to a particular region or MC issue only related to MC.

**APPENDIX E**

**ADJUDICATORY, LICENSING, AND PROGRAM DIRECTION  
BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS PROPOSED TO RECEIVE COMPENSATION**

B/C/C Name (# members)	Current Annual Pay	Estimated # of Meetings/year (in 4 hours increments)	Estimated Individual Member Annual Pay	Estimated Chair Annual Pay (\$80/mtg )	Estimated Total B/C/C Annual Pay (\$60/mtg)	TOTAL
<b>ADJUDICATORY</b>						
Animal Matters Hearing Board (10) (5 are alternates)	None	36	\$2,160	\$2,880.	\$19,440 (incl. alt.)	\$22,320
Board of Appeals (5)	\$18,615/yr. Chair \$12,999 Members*	96	\$5,760	\$7,680	\$23,040	\$30,720
Cable Compliance Commission (5) (not included in CERB's study)	None	12	\$720	\$ 960	\$ 2,880	\$3,840
Commission on Common Ownership Communities (15, excl. non-voting)	None	12 24 Hearings (two attend)	\$720	\$ 960	\$10,080 2,880** \$12,960	\$13,920
Ethics Commission (5)	None	12	\$720	\$ 960	\$ 2,880	\$3,840
Historic Preservation Commission (9)	None	22	1,320	\$ 1,760	\$10,560	\$12,320
Com. on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (12; 3 are alt.)	None	12 36 Hearings (three attend)	\$720	\$ 960	\$10,080 6,480** \$16,560	\$17,520
Merit System Protection Board (3)	\$8,314 Chair; \$6,754 Members	24 36 Hearings	\$1440	\$ 1,920	\$ 2,880 6,480** \$9,360	\$11,280
Sign Review Board (3-CERB rec. 5)	None	12	\$720	960	\$ 2,880 (for 5 members)	\$ 3,840.
<b>LICENSING</b>						
Board of Electrical Examiners (5)	\$4,689 Chair; \$3,654 Members*	36	\$2,160	\$2,880	\$8,640	\$11,520
Board of License Commissioners (5)	\$10,000 Chair \$9,000 Members/year	48	\$2,880	\$ 3,840	\$11,520	\$15,360
Board of Reg. for Building Contractors (5)	None	12	\$720	\$ 960	\$2,880.	\$3,840
<b>PROGRAM DIRECTION</b>						
Fire and Rescue Commission (7)	\$10,417/year plus \$1500 expenses	12	\$720	\$ 960	\$ 4,320	\$ 5,280
Housing Opportunities Commission (7)	None	12	\$720	\$ 960	4,320	\$ 5,280
Revenue Authority (5)	None	12	\$720	\$ 960	\$2,880	\$ 3,840
<b>Annual TOTAL</b>	<b>\$241,157</b>					<b>\$164,720</b>

\*Adjustment every July or December tied to CPI-U

\*No Chair differential included in hearing calculations.

**Compensation Proposal:** Only voting members and alternates that attend meetings get paid. (Currently members are paid regardless of attendance). Amount recommended per meeting is a stipend based on a set amount for meetings up to four hours and over four hours. B/C/C members currently being paid would keep their current pay until they are reappointed or go off the b/c/c per current law. Paid b/c/c members should be eligible to claim dependent care reimbursement. No subcommittee meetings are compensated, only the monthly meeting of the b/c/c and any formal hearings or testing sessions. Time spent preparing for meetings or performing follow-up work is not compensated. Any change to the Board of License Commissioners compensation would require state legislation.